



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>





DEVELOPEMENT
OF
THE CRUEL AND DANGEROUS
INQUISITORIAL SYSTEM

OF
The Court of Rome

IN
IRELAND,

And of its particular Operations in the Case of the Author,

THE REV. L. MORRISSY,

Parish Priest of ONING and TEMPLORUM, in the Diocese of Ossory and
County of Kilkenny, and Roman Catholic Chaplain to
His Majesty's Prisons in Dublin.

~~~~~  
" Subditi vitia *Praetatorum* reprehendere studeant."

" Let subjects be particular in reprehending the vices and correcting  
the abuses of *Prelates*."—POPE GREG. XIII.



Dublin :

PRINTED FOR J. O. BONSALE, 29, DAWSON-STREET,  
B. Dugdale, 6, Dame-street, M. Watson, 2, Capel-street, M. Keene,  
6, College-green, C. P. Archer, Dame-street, R. M. Timms,  
Grafton-street, J. Charles, Mary-street, Archer and  
Burnside, Capel-street, R. Milliken, Grafton-  
street, Kempston, L. Sackville-street.

1821.

110. i. 197. 61

# **ERRATA.**

**Page 43, line 23, for 1813 read 1814.**

**PRELIMINARY  
OBSERVATIONS.**



WHEN I attempt to treat of the detestable tribunal of the Inquisition, which, at different times, overwhelmed the Catholic countries of Europe with distress and dismay, and corrupted the principles of morality and the integrity of the human mind, wherever its progress was permitted and its direful effects felt with impunity; my principal object is to discover how far this diabolical system extends its baneful influence over the minds, the morals and the inclinations of the inhabitants of poor distracted Ireland; and also how far a revolutionary spirit of disloyalty and subversion of what is deemed heretical monarchy is engendered and hatched among a certain portion of his majesty's subjects, for the horrid purposes

prescribed by the legislators of this holy tribunal, yet undiscovered and uncontroled in our native soil to the present time. For the better understanding of the mortal hatred entertained by Roman Catholics against all other sects, I shall make use of the same appellations given them by their declared enemies and sworn opponents.

In this epitome of personal injuries and treasonable conspiracies, the plan I shall pursue will be:—First, to quote some of the Papal Constitutions, Ecumenical Councils, and Ecclesiastical Authors of the Holy Inquisition, as the basis of the present treatise:—Secondly, the persecutions, anathemas, and execrations annexed to the general principle; the conspiracy devised and preconcerted against the Reverend Laurence Morrissy, (Parish Priest of Oning and Templeorum, in the Diocese of Ossory and County of Kilkenny, and R. C. Chaplain of His Majesty's Jails and Bridewells in the City of Dublin,) on the grounds of confirmed heresy and liege fidelity to his king and constitution, conformable to the principles and laws of the Holy Inquisition;—treasonable plots and sanguinary measures of foreign power and domestic influence discovered, and now developed;

and thereby the baneful results emanating from this intolerant institution, partly exemplified in the punishments inflicted on the pastor of Oning and Templeorum; and the unwarrantable impositions of illegal taxations and uncanonical privations of the spiritual rights of the subject, by the overbearing power of ecclesiastical superiors,

In exhibiting the corrupt practices of the iniquitous Inquisition, and exploring authentic details replete with the enormity of complicated vices and deplorable abuses, I am complying with the united mandate of religion and humanity, both atrociously outraged by the existence of such a tribunal. I am fully convinced that some plodding writers, clinging to old prejudices, and episcopal flatterers panting after ecclesiastical preferments, will omit nothing to support this colossus, the tutelar genius of accumulated vices and gross ignorance; but their sophisms cannot overshadow the face of truth, nor their impotent raileries startle the resolutions I have formed to combat the audacity of implacable enemies. The enthusiastic catholic and semi-divine will endeavour to support that the clergy, as well as the laity, are strictly bound to obey their spiritual superiors in all things com-



manded by them, without any inquiry or investigation. Such declarations are exclusively made by the supporters and abettors of the inquisitorial system alluded to.—“*Obsequium et obedientia debita a clericis erga superiores suos, non debet esse irrationabilis et fatua;*” “The submission and obedience required of clergymen towards their superiors, should not be irrational and infatuated.”—“*Sacerdotes et laici possunt examinare, inquire et se facere certiores de justitia vel injustitia, sententiarum a superioribus aut episcopis contra se ipsos delatarum. Et si dictæ censuræ contra formam per canones et concilia præscriptam latæ sint, obsequium istis non sit præstandum, sed tales sententiæ potius contemni et despici; nam canones et dictiones conciliorum, &c. sunt superiores, presides et directores nostri; idcirco obedire oportet dictis superioribus nostris quam inferioribus eorum episcopis.*” “Both clergy and laity can examine, enquire, and inform themselves of the justice or injustice of the censures pronounced against them by their superiors or bishops; and if said censures are inflicted contrary to the form prescribed by the canons and councils, they are not to be obeyed; but on the contrary, such sentences or censures are rather to be contemned and despised: for the canons and

decisions of councils, &c. are our superiors, presidents and directors; and for that reason we are bound to obey these as our superiors rather than bishops who are inferior to them."

I had always a natural repugnancy to all revolutionary systems and disloyal principles. These, my opinions, provoked the obloquy and indignation of my spiritual superiors and clerical brethren, and brought on me such a flood of persecutions as induced me to make diligent search into the different modes of ecclesiastical government at different periods, and found, by woful experience, that the inquisitorial system entirely differs from the true discipline practised in the early ages of the church. From the practical knowledge I have acquired for the long period of upwards of twenty years on the Irish mission, and intimate information I have received for a considerable time in Rome, both by theory and practice, in the inquisitorial courts of that capital, wherein my case was in agitation for the space of four years, I consider myself bound in conscience, for the sake of religion, the good of my country, and preservation of the state, to disclose and make public those detestable measures and treasonable plots, (now in contemplation,) that will ultimately termi-

nate in the destruction of —, if not timely prevented by *legal interference and necessary precaution*. For this laudable purpose I brought with me from Rome the best and most recent documents, which I can produce on proper application being made.

A

## BRIEF STATEMENT

OF

*The Reasons for which I was deprived of my Parish, situated in the Diocese of Ossory, Co. Kilkenny, which I possessed for the long period of 14 years as Parish Priest.*



AS the original and final cause of my privation was grounded on the system of the Holy Inquisition, I shall trace it to the source, and quote some Papal constitutions, ecclesiastical authorities, and domestic intrigues, to prove the existence of this horrible tribunal, even in this country, whereby I was unjustly treated and cruelly persecuted.

The first constitution of Pope Innocent IV. beginning *Cum adversus*. This constitution was enacted the 31st October, 1242, and contains the following laws:—

1. *Ut Heretici*—That Heretics, condemned by the Roman Catholic Church, &c. are to be handed over to the secular power for punishment, (*where the secular power supports this tribunal*.)

2. That Heretics, although penitent, are to be perpetually imprisoned.

3. That Heretics are to be taken up every where, and consigned to the Inquisitors.

4. That the favourers and abettors of Heretics are to be punished, as well as Heretics themselves, &c.

5. That they are, by virtue of the same law, to be punished in like manner, even in case they would make their escape and fly to another country.

6. That the repentance of Heretics, who relapse, is not to be received.

7. That their appeals are not to be listened to, or received.

8. That their descendants, to the second generation, are to be deprived of their temporal benefices and public offices.

9. That the Inquisitors are to be favoured every where.

10. That Heretics are to be carefully kept in custody until they are condemned.

11. That Heresy is to be accounted among public crimes, and adjudged greater than the crime of high treason.

12. That impenitent Heretics are to be burned alive.

13. That the favourers of Heretics are to be perpetually banished, and their properties confiscated.

14. That the children of the favourers and abettors of Heretics, are deprived and expelled from all dignities and honours, except they would discover of some Heretic.

15. That Heretics are to be always looked upon and considered as infamous people, and not to be confided in; that their goods are to be confiscated, and that their children cannot inherit their property.

16. That those who are suspected of Heresy, unless they satisfactorily clear themselves from that suspicion, are considered as *infamous people*, and as *banditti*; and if they persevere for twelve months under this suspicion, they are to be condemned as Heretics, &c.

17. That those invested with the civil power, and Rectors in their respective places, are to be bound down by an oath to persecute Heretics publicly.

18. That many more punishments, to be mentioned hereafter, are to be inflicted on those who favour Heretics, and also on those who believe them.

19. That these laws are universal, and are to be observed and put in execution every where, &c.

20. That Heresy is never to be tolerated; but, on the contrary, is always to be punished. (HERESIS NUNQUAM TOLERANDA, SED SEMPER PUNIENDA.)

Pope Boniface VIII. afterwards confirmed the above laws in the year 1294.

Pope Clement V. (A. D. 1305) made a similar constitution against repealing the punishments prescribed by his predecessors against Heretics.

The first Constitution of Pope John XXII.

Incipiens, (ex parte) 1410. This Pope described Heretics and their crimes in the following manner :

1. The crime of Heresy, by its own impiety, exceeds all other impiety ; it is more execrable than all other crimes, and therefore calls aloud for more severe punishments than all other crimes do.

2. Heretics are the receptacles of all wickedness, as they are described in the 23d chap. of St. Matthew, *Duces Cœsi, &c. viz. the leaders of the blind, serpents, the generation of vipers, full of rapine and impurity, of baseness, hypocrisy and iniquity.* Therefore, the Son of the Most High wished to have his immaculate and spotless church armed with a two-edged sword, in order to bring these nefarious and wicked sects to the paths of truth, or inflict *perpetual punishments.*

3. It is forbidden to receive Heretics, though allied by affinity and consanguinity.

4. Heresy, though ever so trivial, entirely subverts faith.

5. The Popes never repealed or abrogated the constitutions established by their predecessors against heretical pravity, but on the contrary generally confirmed, and renewed them occasionally, viz. Paul IV. in const. 19. An. 1555, and Pius V. in const. 22, An. 1566, beginning *Inter Mutiplices.*

In his 4th const. Pope John XXII. did not monopolize what did not belong to himself, alluding to this country, whereas it is clearly evident, that the kingdom of Ireland was not only tributary, but also feudal to the Holy

See. To prove that Ireland belongs to Saint Peter, it suffices to adduce the authority of Adrian IV. When Henry II. desired the possession of this kingdom, he obtained the investiture of it from the same Pope in this manner: "Truly, Ireland, and all other Islands which the Son of Justice, Jesus Christ, enlightened, and which received the doctrine of Christianity, are the undoubted right of St. Peter, and the Holy Roman Church, (as your own majesty hath recognised :) for you have, my dear child, signified to us, that you wish to enter the kingdom of Ireland for the sake of civilizing the people by wholesome laws, and to extirpate the reigning vices practised among them; and also to pay the tribute of one piece of silver out of every house to Saint Peter, and to preserve the ecclesiastical rights and jurisdictions inviolate. We therefore highly approve of your laudable desire, and give our full assent to your benevolent petition, &c. You may enter that island, and may the inhabitants receive you with due honour, and venerate you as their lord! The authority of the church is always to be free and kept inviolate, and the tribute of one piece of silver, as aforesaid, to be annually paid to St. Peter and to the Holy Roman Church." This also the people of Ireland testified, says Polydorus, lib. 13. *Histor. Anglic. ibi. de Hen. II. Angliæ rege, qui Hiberniam occuparat.* The king went to Dublin, and there convened the bishops and regulars, and treated with them concerning the realm, which he obtained for himself and



- his posterity; that measure the Irish opposed, and denied him to be their king, unless by the authority of the Pope, because from the time that Christianity was received in the island they gave themselves and their all up to him; and they constantly affirmed (as they do now assert) that they will have no other lord or king but the Pope. The king having heard these declarations shortly after implored, by Legates, Alex. III. Adrian's successor, to join Ireland, which he lately civilized, to the kingdom of England, by his authority; and the same Pope by the Apostolic authority; confirmed to him and his heirs the aforesaid kingdom of Ireland.

Constitution 9, John XXII. beginning *Exigit, &c.* The Popes allow the Inquisitors to have armed people about them, for the suppression of heretical pravity and self defence, &c.

Const. 12, of Pope John also, (*Cum nonnulli.*) Roman Catholics are forbidden to associate with Heretics, &c. if they do, they are liable to be suspected of Heresy, and to be punished by the Inquisitors, &c.

Constitution 10, of Pope Martin V. (A. D. 1428.)

1. In this Constitution he enacted many punishments both against laics and clergymen who would indite an ecclesiastic before a civil tribunal, and commence an action either real, personal, mixed, civil or criminal. The punishments fulminated against them, are, 1st, An excommunication with respect to all opponents.—2d. An interdict with respect to the

community; and 3rdly, a clergyman concerned in citing another clergyman, loses his cause, *ipso jure*, without any privilege of evading such censures or punishments.

A lay judge incurs the same punishments by bringing clergymen to an account, or to trial before his own tribunal.

A. D. 1555, Pope Paul IV. said, that the benefices of Heretics become vacant the very instant they fall into Heresy, *ipso jure*.

Pope Pius IV. also declared the same, A. D. 1559, and several others.

19th March, 1587, Sixtus V. decreed, that letters should be sent free to the General Inquisitors all over the world.

Pope Paul V. A. D. 1605, declared it a violation of faith to abjure the deposing and absolving powers in cases of Heresy, viz. Powers to depose heretical kings, and in their realms to create Catholic kings—Powers to absolve subjects from their oaths of allegiance to Heretical monarchs.

A. D. 1642, Urban VIII. and after him in the year 1663, Alexander VII. granted the same privileges—and *Pius V. on all occasions to Ireland*.

Benedict XIV. in the last century, made several constitutions against Heretics, at the head of his Cardinals, in his palace at *Monte Cavallo*. In one of these he says, that a man who incurs a censure on account of Heresy, cannot be absolved by an ordinary confessor, but by a clergyman who hath an expressed faculty for that purpose; therefore I recollect

my bishop, Dr. Marum of Kilkenny, wanted me some time back to go to his Diocesan Penitentiary for absolution; I refused to comply with such an absurdity; this, of course, increased his indignation. I could mention several other decrees and bulls of this same century.

There are many other constitutions and decretals made and established for the horrid purposes of murdering Heretics, confiscating their properties, and disinheriting their children; for degrading, dispossessing and burning clergymen who would be-friend, receive, abet, or defend Heretics; also for the sacrilegious purposes of *remitting the sins—granting indulgences—and imposing sacramental penances* productive of *grace and remission of crimes* to those who should *imbrue their hands in the blood of Heretics, particularly proscribed Heretics, excommunicated (ipso jure) by the Holy Apostolic See*, as the Protestants of these countries are, &c. &c.

I shall not at present enter into a full discussion and minute detail of the laws affecting the lives, properties, and vital happiness of my countrymen, as I intend without much delay, and as soon as time will permit, to develop the intrigues of foreign power and ecclesiastical influence, and expose the projects of domestic enemies, in their full extent, for the good of my country.

After quoting (to the present age, from century to century,) so many indisputable authorities to prove the real existence of the above laws, can any intelligent and rational

man say, or even insinuate, that they are antiquated and now repealed? However, if any should entertain a doubt, or maintain the contrary, I shall remove all ambiguity and imprint a thorough conviction on the minds of all liberal and well disposed men, by adducing *a living example*. Behold our present Pope Pius VII. together with the congregation of the Universal Inquisition, announcing themselves by insertion in the Roman Register of 1819, as the authors and abettors of the inquisitorial system.

## CONGREGAZIONI.

### S. ROMANA, ED UNIVERSALE INQUISIZIONE.

La Santità di Nostro Signore, Prefetto—The Pope, Prefect.

Emo Sig. Card. Giulio Maria della Somaglia, Segretario, Secretary.

|                                          |                                  |
|------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Emi Mattei, Litta, di Pietro, Pacca,     | } Cardinali,<br>Chief<br>Judges. |
| Brancadoro, Gabrielli, Caseli, Opizzoni, |                                  |
| Fontana, Consalvi, &c. &c.               |                                  |

### RMI. CONSULTORI.

Monsigg. Francesco Bertazzoli, Arciv. di Edessa.

|                                            |               |
|--------------------------------------------|---------------|
| Candido Maria Frattini, Arciv. di Filippi, | } Consultors. |
| Pietro Caprano, Arciv. d' Iconio, &c.      |               |

Fabrizio Turiozzi, Assessore—Assessor.

Carlo Pedicini, Segretario di Propaganda, &c. Secretary

This Register I brought with me from Rome, and also the author I am just now to quote as a further proof of the desolating system.

How many Councils have sanctioned and

enacted similar decrees, viz. the fourth Council of Lateran, and the Council of Trent, the last general Council, &c.

A. D. 1818, Devoti, an Archbishop in Rome, wrote the course of the Ecclesiastical Law, *Superiorum Facultate*, under the immediate inspection of the Pope and Cardinals. In this work is a treatise describing the inquisitorial laws, from their commencement to the present period, their perpetuity and universality, their obligation in conscience, under pain of ecclesiastical censures and canonical excommunication. He says that the “Dominicians were and are the principal agents, next to the Bishops, employed by the Popes against Heretical pravity, and to give every necessary information for the detection, punishment, and abolition of anti-catholics,” &c. We have among us one Arch-Prelate, a Dominican Friar, who is very much esteemed in Rome as a zealous Inquisitor, Irish Informer, and avenger of heresy: he pretends loyalty to escape suspicion, for the subversion of——. The same Devoti declares in his Canonical Institutions, that “there are many ecclesiastical and civil punishments enacted against Heretics; that the Church smites them with the pain of excommunication, and deprives them of ecclesiastical communion, because those who divorced themselves from it are not to be kept in it; neither are they allowed to hold communion with the faithful, who are capable of corrupting them by their monstrous opinions and depraved examples, for rotten flesh and scabbed sheep

should be removed from the flock. Those who knowingly inter Heretics in consecrated ground, who favour them, receive them as guests, defend them or commune with them are liable to the same punishments. Besides, if clergymen become Heretics they are deprived of all ecclesiastical offices, and are perpetually deposed; and in general Heretics are irregular, whether they are baptized in Heresy, or fall into Heresy after receiving baptism in the Catholic faith: for after their conversion they are received as laics into the Catholic Church.

All Catholics are bound (especially if required) to bring and accuse all Heretics, and those suspected of Heresy, before the tribunal of the Inquisition. There is a living example of this requisition and immediate compliance in real existence—When in the year 1815, the Prelate of the diocese of Ossory ordered the clergy and laity to collect and bring their accusations to the inquisitorial tribunal, held in Kilkenny that year in the Bishop's house against me.

The Roman Archbishop, Devoti, affirms that “people of infamous character are allowed to proceed and bear testimony against Heretics and their abettors.” Can any man of candour and liberal sentiments live safe or happy, or practise loyalty, where such intolerant laws and inhuman proceedings are permitted with impunity to be put in force?

“The names of accusers and witnesses are not to be revealed, and an obligation of profound silence and secrecy is to be imposed on all.”—*Lib. iv. Tit. 8. § 13.*

Judicious reader, I am now fully satisfied that I have incontrovertibly impressed a thorough conviction of the institution, existence, and perpetuity of the Papal Constitutions and Ecclesiastical Laws, affecting many realms and various constitutions ; and also of the *primary view, present scheme, and future design, of the deposition of heretical monarchs, abolition of heretical legislation, and subversion of heretical states.* But spiritual superiors, clerical brethren, and Irish Roman Catholics will tell you, that they reprobate and disavow such horrible laws, (though binding under severe censures) ; and that no vestiges can be traced, or principles found, to prove the existence of such intolerant measures in loyal Ireland, by foreign influence and domestic execution, either in theory or in practise ; and on the contrary that loyalty is supported and rebellion suppressed by the pen and influence of the prelate, the exhortation of the pastor, and fidelity of the subject.

As the foregoing precedents demonstrate the veracity of the existing principles, so does the sequel prove the fallacy of boasted loyalty, and liege fidelity.

Let us now examine whether the above specified laws and inquisitorial systems are directly or indirectly hatched, and perhaps nourished to full maturity, in our native country. It may not be delusive to assert, that there is no place more ripe or better prepared for their sanguinary operations.

Our Irish Prelates, Roman Catholic Bishops, on the day of their consecration take an oath

of allegiance to the reigning Pope and his successors: let not the substance be mutilated or the form deranged, for the original can be produced. I have been lately present at a consecration where such an oath was solemnly taken. The following extracts are selected from it.

*“ Ego, N. Electus Ecclesiæ N. ab hoc hora in antea fidelis, et obediens ero beato,” &c.*  
*“ I, N. elect of such a church, from henceforth will be faithful and obedient to St. Peter the apostle, and to the holy Roman Church, and to our Lord Pope N. and to his successors. I shall never to their prejudice or detriment, reveal to any man the counsel they shall entrust me with, either by themselves, their Nuncios, or letters. The Roman Papacy and the Regalities of St. Peter I will help them to keep and maintain against all men. I shall take care to conserve, defend, increase, and promote the rights, honours, privileges and authorities of the Holy Roman Church, for our Lord the Pope and his successors. I will observe, with all my power, and shall make others do the same, the rules of the Holy Fathers, the Apostolic (Papal) decrees, ordinations, dispositions, reservations, provisions and mandates. I will persecute and fight against all Heretics, Schismatics and Rebels to our Lord the Pope and his successors. I shall visit personally the shrine of the Apostles every third year, and render an account of all my pastoral office to the Pope and his successors, and of all the affairs of my church, and discipline of my clergy and people; and will receive the Apostolical or Papal mandates, and shall put*



*them most diligently into execution; and if justly prevented, I shall make the necessary communication through some other proper clergyman," &c. &c.*

Abbots take the same oath of allegiance and fidelity in their benedictions.

"Ego, Electus Monasterii N. ab hac hora in antea, fidelis et obediens ero, Beato," &c.  
 "I, N. elect of such a Monastery, from henceforth will be faithful," &c.

The Council of Trent decreed that canons, dignitaries, parish priests, and all ecclesiastics who would have the care of souls, and direction of the people, should make a public profession of faith, and take an oath of obedience and fidelity to the Pope, and his successors. Sess. xxiv. cap. 12. (tantamount to the above, &c.)

Pope Pius IV. made a similar decree, and issued a Bull in confirmation of these oaths in the year 1564. "Pius Episcopus servus servorum Dei, ad perpetuam rei memoriam. Nos volentes," &c. "We also wishing that, besides the above specified dignitaries and those who preside over the flock, the superiors of monasteries, convents, and all other religious houses of every religious order, should be uniformly bound by the same ties of public obedience to the Roman Church, and solemn oath to the existing Pope, and his successors, do order and decree that the following form of the profession of faith and oath of fidelity must be publicly and every where taken, (*ubique gentium*) received and observed, by virtue of these presents and our apostolic authority,

under the same punishments prescribed by the Council of Trent.

I shall quote a few passages contained in this form of profession of faith, and oath of allegiance and liege fidelity, &c.

“Ego, N. firma fide credo et profiteor omnia et singula,” &c. “I, N. with a firm faith believe and profess all and each, &c. I most firmly admit and embrace the apostolic and ecclesiastical traditions, and all the other observations and constitutions of the same church. I without doubt or hesitation receive and profess all other things defined and declared by the sacred, canonical, and ecumenical Councils, especially by the Council of Trent. And at the same time I do in like manner condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all Heresies of all kind condemned, rejected, and anathematized by the Roman Catholic Church. And truly this Catholic faith and profession I, at this moment, spontaneously profess and sincerely hold, and the same I shall hold and acknowledge entire and inviolate to the end of my life; and the same I will, to the utmost of my power, make my subjects and those committed to my charge hold, teach and preach. I promise, vow and swear: so help me God, and these holy Gospels of God.” “We ordain that no person shall infringe or contradict this declaration of our will and mandate: if any will presume to do so, he shall incur the indignation of the Almighty God, and of the holy Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul. Given in

Rome, at St. Peter's, in the year of the incarnation our Lord 1564, the Ides of November, and fifth year of our Pontificate.

*FREDERIC CARD. CESSIUS,  
Cæsar Glorierius."*

The Court of Rome is now appointing and creating Notary Apostolics more than ever—These jurisdictionary powers were not before conferred on any besides the clergy, but this time back the same privileges and authority are extended to some of the laity, who are, as well as the clergy, bound by an oath of fidelity and obedience to the Holy See.

Form—"Ego, N. post hanc horam fidelis et obediens ero B. Petro Apos. et Papæ septimo," &c. as before. "I, N. shall be faithful to," &c. "Papatum Romanum, et regalia S. Petri ac jura Ecclesiæ Romanæ, &c. Jurabo et defendam," &c. &c. This oath is taken in Ireland before the Bishops or their Vicars.

Alexander IV. in his 15th constitution bound the laity to assist Bishops and Inquisitors to take, &c. Heretics; and said that they are bound, especially if asked to take an oath to that purpose, viz. to assist, counsel and favour them in their proceedings against Heretical pravity, &c.; and in case of their refusal or hindering them, they incur an excommunication, and are to be deprived of their honour and office, and are incapable of holding any office for the future. Innocent IV. and Urban IV, declare the same.

After advancing so many authentic documents, and quoting so many indisputable au-

thorties, can any rational, intelligent, and impartial man deny that there is a coalition of foreign influence, ecclesiastical overtures, and domestic acquiescence, maintained by mutual engagements and solemn oaths for the execrable purposes already described, by papal constitutions, decretals of general councils, and ecclesiastical laws of episcopal synods. The long, complicated, and preconcerted measure cannot any longer be hid in the shades of obscurity. Behold the regular concatenation of sanguinary pursuits and sinister views, from the chief pontiff down to the most obscure plebeian and abandoned character! A solemn attestation of the Divine Being for the confirmation of truth and justice, is now become a bond of iniquity between pontiffs, cardinals, prelates, dignitaries, pastors, clergy, religious and laity, (few, comparatively, excepted,) for the horrid purposes of exterminating Heretics, confiscating their properties, and disinheriting their children—of preventing every resource of redress and vindication, by inflicting similar punishments on their abettors, defenders and associates! May I presume to ask my learned and conscientious bishops, What are the necessary conditions of a lawful oath? They will, I am confident, reply and say, *truth, justice and judgment*. I shall then take the liberty of asking their lordships, Are all these conditions, or even any of them, to be found in the oath above alluded to, which they take privately in their rooms, or sacristies, in the presence of the consecrating bishop and the rest of the prelates and clergy, before their public

consecration in the chapel? If not, I will again ask, is an oath given without these conditions, perjury or not? If it is, I shall beg pardon for asking the third time, Is the word, oath or evidence of a perjurer to be either believed or received? If such an oath is no perjury, the good divines and practical civilians, and all men of sound judgment, are wrong, and deceive others in teaching and inculcating the contrary doctrine. May I here insert the Roman adage—*Semel mendax semper mendax*, —*semel perjurus semper perjurus*, once a liar always a liar—once a perjurer, always a perjurer. I may be told by an Inquisitor, or even an honest man and good christian, that, though the Holy Inquisition and its binding laws and inquisitorial intrigues, are theoretically planted in Irish hearts, still no presages of its direful operations can be traced, or even allowed by our glorious constitution. I allow in the first instance, that the inquisitorial system cannot be put in force by murdering, burning, imprisoning, &c. but I assert that it is scrupulously and tyrannically put in force as far as the Inquisitors and Judges can, without infringing on the restraining laws, or exposing their private views; although their extraordinary zeal and mortal hatred against all other sects and their suspected friends, make them sometimes outstep the legal mark, and inflict intolerant pains and unjust privations, as I shall now disclose by a living example.

As the foundation of my misfortunes is now laid, I shall briefly begin to relate the painful history.

In the year 1797 I began my mission in the town of Ballyragget, within three miles of Castlecomer and eight of Kilkenny. In 1798 I had an occasion to shew and prove my loyalty in preaching against the rebellion, which at that time threatened destruction in that country. The active part I took in keeping down a revolutionary spirit, and the unfeigned loyalty I shewed on all occasions, made Inquisitors believe that I was true to my king and country. One day I dined with a Roman Catholic Bishop, in company with some of his clergymen. In conversation they reprobated the conduct of General Johnson for killing the rebels at the battle of Ross, County Wexford. I remarked, that they deserved the punishment for rebelling against their king and constitution;—I was immediately checked by the bishop and clergymen. Here the Inquisition began to flash in the face of a suspected abettor of heretical pravity its bitter invectives (*Si non Verberibus, Verbis*. See Constit. Inn. IV.) The sworn bishop and his faithful inquisitors expressed their liege fidelity to a foreign power. In the time of the rebellion, the bishop of the diocese wherein I lived told me, that some of his clergy were encouraging the subversion of the constitution—I expressed no desire of imitation, nor shewed any marks of approbation; I never after saw or heard that these suffered any censure. I was always considered (both by clergy and laity) a declared enemy to all inquisitorial laws and rebellious systems.

In the year 1801 I was sent to the united parishes of Oning and Templeorum, as a *quasi*

*parochus* to the Rev. Mr. Lalor, then a superannuated P. P. of said Parish, by my bishop, Dr. Lanigan, with a promise of succession. The following year, 1802, Mr. Lalor resigned these parishes formally and canonically into the hands of his bishop, Dr. Lanigan, who immediately appointed me as P. P. to the same living, and left me in the full enjoyment and peaceable possession of it to the hour of his death, which, alas! happened the 11th of February, 1812.

In the year 1810, the infatuated people called Caravats, &c. were forcibly taking fire-arms from the gentlemen of that country, and shooting some of them; holding nocturnal meetings, and disturbing the happiness of the peaceable inhabitants. I spoke from my altars against such illegal proceedings and rebellious dispositions, and exhorted my flock to keep and preserve the peace and tranquillity of the country, and to guard against the intrusion of strangers, who might endeavor to contaminate their principles, and inflame their minds with chimerical ideas of subverting the constitution, for the purpose of ameliorating their condition, and establishing religious liberties.

My loyalty on this occasion was construed into a great crime. My admonition to my flock on this subject was a principal charge—an unpardonable offence, for which in a few years after my new bishop told me I should be tried and punished according to the decision of his inquisitorial clergymen.

In the year 1812, immediately after Doctor Lanigan's death, Doctor Mansfield, P. P. of

**Kilmaganny**, was appointed Vicar Capitular by the Diocesan Chapter, with full powers to govern the diocese until a bishop would be appointed; he also made the present Doctor Marum (who was then P. P. only) his Vicar General, to assist him in the discharge of his new administration, and execution of Heretical pravity. *The choice was ominous, for he studied in Spain!!!* Now, according to the Council of Trent, these clergymen, on becoming members of the Holy Inquisition, should take an oath of perpetual obedience and liege fidelity to persecute Heretics and fight against them; but the question was, how could this strayed sheep, this heretical priest, be separated and banished from the sound, the inquisitorial tribe of the diocese of Ossory; as no other canonical crime could be fully established, and as the civil power did not recognise the holy tribunal? Therefore it was necessary and incumbent on these faithful officers to devise some plan to cover the scheme, and punish the Heretic.

*Ad rem.*—In 1812, I was determined to build a parish chapel, or repair the old one in the parish of Templeorum. I gave my parishioners the plan and size of a good chapel, built and just finished in a neighboring parish for £600, with which they were in general well pleased. This chapel would be full large and sufficiently commodious, as there was another in the same parish to which nearly half the congregation went to mass on Sundays and holydays. The Vicar Capitular, Dr. Mansfield, contrary to custom and the law of the Church, took the building and management of it out of



the hands of the lawful pastor, and gave it to his curate and a few of his parishioners. This was the policy of the inquisitorial court of Ossory, as a pretext to disgrace the Heretic, and despoil him of his ecclesiastical preferment and benefice. Behold the scheme!—"We will first give this building to these people under the pretence that their parish priest would not build it for them; secondly, we will build it on so large scale as they cannot finish; and thirdly, when it will be impossible to accomplish it, we shall then insist on the pastor to undertake the work, and in case of refusal, will declare him utterly unworthy of being a Parish Priest and presiding over a flock, who would not build a house of worship for the honor of God and the good of the people." The laity were instruments in the hands of the sacerdotal inquisitors and presiding judges, in order to accomplish the destruction of the favourer and abettor of proscribed Heretics. In my presence the Vicar Capitular desired them to adopt any plan they would think well of, and applot any taxes they should deem proportionable, and that he would insist on the payment; and at the same time told me, if I would oppose these measures he would proceed against me, insinuating that he would deprive me of my benefice. Conformable to his instructions and private understanding with some of the parishioners, and without consulting the parish at large, the foundation of a chapel was laid which would amount to £3000, according to the estimate of the best architects in that country, and they applotted the extraordinary tax of 6s. per acre, (many acres in said parish were

not worth that sum;) the people murmured at the assumption of this arbitrary power, and the injustice of this illegal taxation; therefore some would not pay, several had not the necessary means; others were reduced to mendicity, and under the necessity of running away from their landlords without paying their rents and lawful debts. Notwithstanding this great distress and visible poverty, the Vicar Capitular, in his elevated capacity, begins now to scatter his inquisitorial censures from the lofty tops of the Walsh mountains (so called) to the level banks of the river Suir, as the following letter will shew:

*Kilmaganny, 13th December, 1812.*

“ Rev. Sir—As I find that only few people at your side of the parish paid their subscriptions towards the building of their parish chapel, I now give them this notice, that unless the entire of their subscriptions shall be paid in before New Year’s Day, I shall prohibit Mass, under pain of suspension, to be given in the chapel of Pilltown, in the aforesaid parish, and every other part of the parish, except the two parish chapels on New Year’s Day, and every subsequent Sunday and Holyday, until the whole be paid. You will, I hope, earnestly urge them to it. There is a strong insinuation that they are countenanced by you. I remain your humble servant, RICHARD MANSFIELD.

*To the Rev. Mr. Morrissy, Bessborough.*

This enjoined order, implying a matter of extreme distress and spiritual direliction, was complied with; therefore every opportunity of fulfilling the ecclesiastical precept of hearing

**Mass and adoring God by prayer, &c. was taken away from the innocent, indigent, and those who paid in said district, as well as from the supposed guilty, for about twelve months. This prohibition and censure was illegal, unjust and irreligious, and not binding either on the people or pastor.**

**1st—It was illegal, because the law of God, the true law of the church, and the law of the land, did not sanction such contributions as could not be reasonably and possibly complied with; besides, it was against the law of the realm to impose such taxes by private authority on his majesty's subjects, against their free will and mutual concurrence.**

**2d.—It was unjust, because it was an unnecessary and oppressive imposition; whereas £600 would build a chapel sufficiently large and commodious for the circumstances of the people and population of the parish; it must be universally acknowledged that the enormous sum of £2,400 applotted on a poor country parish must be altogether unjust, and must unequivocally call aloud for restitution under the pain of eternal woe. "No man can enter the kingdom of Heaven until he shall pay the last farthing." £2,400 is the extra sum after the subtraction of £600 from £3000, whereas £600 was sufficient.**

**3d—It was irreligious—It is the firm belief of the Roman Catholic Church, that every Roman Catholic is bound under the penalty of a grievous sin, to attend their respective places of worship on Sundays and Holydays, unless prevented by a special case of necessity; and that**

any person who is accessory to the prevention of another from the discharge of this obligation incurs the same guilt, and of course is guilty of as many sins as he shall deprive others of the opportunity.

4th—The parishioners were not bound in conscience or justice to the payment of an exorbitant taxation, imposed by despotism—the pastor was not bound, by virtue of obedience, to desert his flock, leaving them weeping and sighing in their solitary abodes, panting after the sacrifice of the altar, the exhortation of their spiritual father, and the graces conferred by the sacraments through his administration, on account of the uncanonical orders and uncharitable prohibitions of an inquisitorial superior. “Non est obediendum, quod contra Deum precipitur.” *S. Isidor.* “We are not to obey whatever is commanded, contrary to God.” And lastly, the mandates of this letter exceed the limits of the parish exclusively concerned, or in any wise bound to the building alluded to; he prohibits Mass to be given on Sundays and Holydays in any part of the parish of Oning, except in the parish chapel, though quite distinct and unconcerned in this respect, by which orders people were interred without a Christian burial in said parish. In a word, several would infer from his conduct on this occasion, that he believed there was no virtue in the sacrifice of the new law, or no particular day appointed for the adoration of the Deity. The insinuation of encouraging the people against paying their subscriptions for said chapel, never existed then or at any other time; had I opposed such taxes, connected

with such unjustifiable circumstances and intolerable injunctions, I confess I would do no more than what I was perhaps bound to do in conscience, and in justice to my flock.

The reverend doctor, wishing still to extend his prohibitions a little farther, and deprive the poor parishioners of more spiritual advantages, sends me the following letter:

*Kilmaganny, 6th June, 1813.*

Rev. Sir—As I find that you are to have a station of confession next Wednesday in the chapel of Piltown, hereby I not only prohibit Mass to be given in the chapel of Piltown on Sundays and Holydays as before, but I also prohibit, under pain of suspension, Mass to be given, or any assembly or congregation for spiritual purposes to be held there, even on week days.

RICHARD MANSFIELD.

*To Rev. L. Morrissy, Bessborough.*

Here the pious doctor prohibits, by severe censures, any good works to be performed, or sacraments to be administered in the chapel of this district, to the indigent, innocent and pennyless. Are there any similar prohibitions to be found in the written word of God, or traditions of the Church? Did the learned doctor consider the decision of the holy fathers—"Baptism and Penance can be given in chapels and places interdicted?" *S. Augustine, &c.*

The Vicar Capitular is not yet satisfied with the inflictions already described for the punishment of heretical pravity, so he sends the following:

*Kilmaganny, 9th Oct 1813.*

Rev. Sir—I do hereby order and enjoin you, under pain of *suspension*, by the fact, not to admit to sacraments those refractory individuals nor any of their family, until they shall have paid their equitable proportion towards advancing their parish chapel. I remain your humble servant,

RICHARD MANSFIELD.

*To Rev. L. Morissy, Bessborough.*

Here the sacraments of salvation are become the *instruments of temporal oppression and spiritual injustice* in the hands of the Doctor. 1st—By withdrawing the sacraments from the people, several of them would, in a great measure, starve themselves—would refuse the payment of lawful debts and legal taxes, imposed for the support of the king and constitution, in order to pay illegal and oppressive taxations, imposed by spiritual superiors for sinister motives and vindictive objects, sooner than suffer the privation of divine and ecclesiastical rights and pastoral consolation. I was an ocular witness on different occasions to the veracity of these assertions; I know some who paid for said chapel out of subscriptions made for buying a coffin, &c. 2dly—The people have an undoubted right to receive the rites and sacraments of their church, whilst they do not render themselves unworthy of them by personal guilt. Now with respect to the case in question, did the wife, the child, and the servant of the recusants and indigents deserve to be deprived of the sacraments, &c.? Certainly every good and respectable divine, true

christian, and rational man, will coincide with me in the negative, and conclude that the prohibitions and suspensions of the above letters, contain nothing solid, spiritual, or exemplary; but on the contrary are replete with temporal oppression and spiritual injustice, with respect to the pastor and his flock.

Now the renowned doctor begins to manifest his unlimited and uncontroled authority, and redoubles his censures as well as his taxes.

*Kilmaganny, 14th Oct. 1813.*

Rev. Sir—I find you begin now to be sincere, but regret that in throwing off every disguise you not only justify the opinion heretofore entertained of you, but seem also to give manifest proofs that your religion is as false as your promises. From your conduct, as I am informed, you must have misinterpreted some words of my letter to you some days back, which were, “ You will not administer, &c. until they shall have paid an *equitable proportion* of the chapel tax.” Now, Sir, the meaning of the last underlined words must obviously be until they should have paid such a proportion of the tax as had been paid by people in equal or similar circumstances with them; yet you have given the words a construction of your own, and acted upon it at no small risk to your conscience. But to remove all ground for error or misapprehension, I do hereby order you, under pain of suspension by the fact, to administer no sacraments or rites to your parishioners, except the last sacraments to persons in imminent danger of

death, and baptism to children, until they shall have paid not only the full amount of the first tax, according as it was settled and applotted, but also a second tax to the same amount with the first. In this prohibition the families of the recusants are included. But as nothing short of a double tax (12s. per acre) would be sufficient to finish the shell of the chapel, it cannot be avoided. If a spark of religion existed in the heart of the pastor, he could easily persuade them that this tax, let it be what it may, would be but a small token of gratitude to God. Your's, &c. RICHARD MANSFIELD  
*To Rev. Mr. Morrissy, Bessborough.*

I suppose the Vicar Capitular in the first part of his letter alludes to the opinion entertained of me as a Heretic, or a friend to Heretics. He pretends I made him promises; which I never did, or could do in conscience—promises to oppress the people, and require impossibilities, for the hidden purposes of preventing disclosures and revealing perfidy; non-compliance betrayed false religion in the estimation of an inquisitorial member. The Vicar sanctioned and desired other priests to give sacraments to some friends and accomplices who did not pay the tax but in part; from this example I considered that I was at liberty to do the same, yet he threatens and reprimands me for administering sacraments, &c. to any, without paying the entire tax; and he calls this error and misapprehension, &c.—he punishes me for doing what he allows others to do—he suspends me from the discharge of my duty, and commands others to intrude on my pastoral rights.



By this letter the difficulties, impositions, and taxations are redoubled: the poor people are taxed 12s. per acre before half the work is done. But with respect to sacramental privations I must do him this common justice, that he is like the relapsing sinner, rising and falling, for in his former letter he prohibited all the sacraments to be administered to the recusants and their families: but in this letter, he permits almost the one half of them to be given to the recusants, &c. I could ardently wish that this reformation might prove effectual, but, alas! I dread the next fall will be a woeful one. I am sorry the noble Doctor did not permit his clergy to administer the last sacraments to those in danger of death, as the great divines and holy Fathers did—No! for he binds them here not to administer them except in case of imminent danger of death, perhaps at a time when the patient could not receive them, or reap but little or no benefit from them.

As I have predicted, the Vicar fell again into his old mode of issuing censures and committing errors, as appears by the following:

*Kilmaganny, 12th March, 1814.*

“Rev. Sir—I enjoin you again to administer no sacraments whatsoever publicly or privately to any person, or any one of his family who shall not have previously paid the full amount of both taxes, nor any of the rites of churching women, blessing clay, or celebrating Mass for them, under pain of suspension, to be incurred by the fact; and any violation of this injunc-

tion you may rely shall be rigorously punished. I also require that Mr. Henebry shall say the Parish Mass in Templeorum, without any obstruction whatever. You married two couple who paid no tax; one in Tobernabroon, and one in Dowling, if so, I beg you look to——

I confess I am at a loss to know what to say—what strictures to make, or ideas to form of these melancholy prohibitions, irreligious injunctions, and general exclusion of men, women and children, born and unborn, guilty or not guilty, from all the sacraments, sacrifices, rites, privileges, &c. of the Catholic Church. My heart feels more than my tongue can express. No man can sufficiently lament this irreparable calamity, but he who contemplates it in mournful silence. I ask you Roman Catholics, can a child be saved without baptism, according to the divine Oracle and the doctrine of our church? “unless a man is born again of water and of the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter the kingdom of Heaven,” can the sinner in leaving this world be saved without repentance? You’ll say “the one cannot without baptism, or the other without real contrition, or at least attrition with the help of the sacrament of penance.” What opinion then will you form of the man who will not allow either the sacraments necessary for salvation, or the auxiliary means to obtain it, and sacred rites of the church to be administered either in case of absolute or ordinary necessity? I venture to anticipate that you will say nothing less than “that no Heretic, whom the Church ever condemned, gave orders more destructive of the very essence of religion!” You

will also confess that Luther and Calvin, against whom, together with their followers, the Roman Church pronounced so many woes and anathemas, never made such an attempt to destroy the divine institution of all the sacraments, sacrifices, rites, &c. by issuing orders in positive terms, under severe censures not to administer to the innocent and pennyless, what Jesus Christ instituted and ordained for their salvation:—no payment no sacrament! The Doctor of censures must acknowledge that there is virtue or no virtue in the sacraments and rites of the Church—If there is any virtue—how could he withdraw them from the well disposed subject?—If there is no virtue—how can he impose on thousands to receive and pay divine homage to what he believes there is no virtue or efficacy in, and of course be guilty of idolatry? I am sorry that he has given sufficient reasons and convincing proofs to the public at large to believe that he is possessed of the deistical idea, that there is no virtue, &c. Candid reader you will tell me that his superiors (on intimation and conviction,) must condemn and punish this ecclesiastic for his Heretical and erroneous principles, or otherwise must participate in his crime—that nothing will palliate but the profession of an inquisitorial member of the holy office. More of this hereafter.

The Vicar also in this letter, foisted another Priest, Mr. Henebry, into my Parish, contrary to the ecclesiastical law, to act in direct opposition to my parochial administration and temporal interest in said benefice; in like manner

he hindered me from preaching and teaching my flock, by giving up my Parish Chapel, and parish Mass to said Mr. Henebry, and excluding me, not without reason indeed, for by this prohibition and exclusion, I should not have the power or liberty of preaching Loyalty, and preventing the inquisitorial systems, &c.

By virtue of these Vicarial censures, the children and servants of the poor recusants could not be married, let what would depend on chances, or disappointments, or melancholy results. To harrass and persecute me more and more, the V. Capitular sent the Rev. Mr. Forestall, P. P. of Callan, a very active inquisitor, into my parish, as an equestrian suspender, who galloped in full speed through the country, until he met me on the high-way in company with several of my parishioners, and there suspended me without assigning any reason, if he knew any. I laughed at the madness and inconsistency of his conduct, but at the same time had compassson on the petulant hireling, who incurred a greater censure, ipso jure, than he thought to inflict.

“Innocent IV. in the first Council of Lyons, said, that censures should be given in writing, (in scriptis,) and the cause also in writing; and that he who violates this Canon incurs the following censure: viz.—Per mensem unum ab ingressu Ecclesiæ, & divinis officiis noverit se suspensum esse, &c. Let him not for a month enter the Church and perform divine offices; and further, if he does he incurs an irregularity which cannot be dispensed with by any but the Pope.”

I did not attend the Diocesan Meeting of the Clergy of Ossory, in Kilkenny, to express and confirm their unequivocal rejection of granting the Crown any interference in the nomination of Bishops—for non-attendance I was decidedly considered a Vetoist, and reported as such throughout my parish and surrounding neighbourhood.

In about twelve months after, the Chapel of Piltown (a village in the parish of Templeorum) was interdicted, the V. Capitular gave me permission to officiate there, and shortly afterwards withdrew that permission, and interdicted it again for non-payment of the taxes; a pretext indeed, for he knew that said taxes would never be paid. At this very time that the Vicar shewed such extraordinary zeal for building Chapels in my parish, he shewed little or no zeal in his own parish: for some of his Chapels were falling, and some for years, perhaps yet, remain unfinished, through which the fowl of the air could fly.

*Different objects, different views!*

*Kilmaganny, 22d April, 1814.*

Rev. Sir—"I do hereby interdict the Chapel of Piltown, and prohibit you to celebrate Mass there until a special permission be given for it. I prohibit you to give Mass in the Chapel or in any house or place in the parish of Templeorum, on Sundays or Holydays without special permission obtained for that purpose, until the full and entire Chapel tax is collected and paid in to those appointed to

receive it. I also prohibit you to receive in future any part of the Chapel tax, but refer those who are disposed to pay it, to the Rev. James Henebry, who alone is authorised to receive it. All the above prohibitions to be observed and obeyed under pain of suspension, to be incurred by the fact. Under the same penalty Mr. Henebry is to administer sacraments to any person that wishes to apply to him, without any kind of molestation or insult. I remain your humble servant,

*RICHARD MANSFIELD.*

*To Mr. Morrissy, Piltown.*

In this letter I am prohibited again to give Mass in the Chapel of Piltown, and also in the parish Chapel or any other part of the parish, &c. and in the interim there is permission and full power given to another Clergyman in my parish. See preceding letter.

In the commencement the V. Capitular took from me the entire management of my parish Chapel, and gave it to others—and afterwards in 1813, at a Conference in Knocktopher, in the County Kilkenny, (in the presence of several Priests,) he desired I should then undertake the building and finishing of said Chapel, (which was then impossible to be accomplished in consequence of the extraordinary plan and exorbitance of taxation, &c.) or otherwise he would send another Priest into my parish and expel me. And again, in this present letter, he forbids me, under pain of suspension by the fact, even to collect a single fraction for this purpose, and to have nothing to do with the

business, but to refer it to an intruder. I am several times prohibited under pain of suspension, to give sacraments to my parishioners, until, &c. and at the same time another Clergyman is ordered under the same penalty to give them sacraments indiscriminately, whether they paid or not. The pretended object was then frustrated.

Here are series of vicissitudes, and various recurrences—multiplied prohibitions, and counter-prohibitions—repeated suspensions and counter-suspensions,—all purporting in different bearings to accomplish the religious edifice, but coalescing in dissembled significations to destroy the loyal man, and render his exertions premature.

Now he makes the last effort, which he hoped would prove effectual, and ultimately establish my final degradation :

*Kilmaganny, 2d August, 1814.*

Rev. Sir—You have absented yourself from some Conferences, and for that reason, I do hereby suspend you from all priestly functions, for the space of three months from the date hereof. Your parish during that interval will be administered and taken care of by the Rev. James Henebry, to whom I give the necessary faculties and jurisdiction for that purpose. I also authorise the said Rev. James Henebry to say Mass in the Chapel of Piltown, on Sundays and Holydays, and to receive the emoluments of it for himself. I am, your humble servant,

*RICHARD MANSFIELD.*

*To Rev. L. Morrissy, Bessborough.*

I shall exactly relate my motives of absence from the Conferences alluded to. The Vicar Capitular had his Inquisitors, especially the Clergy, watching my words, deeds and actions, he received from them a collection of unfounded charges with respect to the chapel business, saying that I opposed it, and prevented the payment by undue influence.

The Vicar advanced groundless complaints against me, at a conference in Knoctopher, before twenty-four Clergymen, though no man appeared to substantiate them. I called for a trial, he refused to give any; I prayed to be heard in my own defence—he would not grant that request or listen to any apology. I asked permission to bring witnesses in my defence, to confront my accusers at the ensuing conference—he would make no such concession; but, on the contrary, said, he would collect all the charges and complaints he could, and bring them publicly against me at the following conferences; and ordered, that I should make no defence or speak a word on the subject, &c. where he had his satellites. All these proceedings are the dead letter of the inquisition, and privileges granted to the ministers of that holy tribunal! Under these circumstances I would not venture to go into this inquisitorial court unprepared, unbefriended and unheard, until matters would be amicably adjusted and finally subsided. How could any man of principle and independence, encounter such degrading treatment? face such uncontroled and declared enemies, and expose himself to the laughter and buffoonery of



besotted bigotry? listen to such accusations without the benefit of an evidence to rebut calumny, and exclaim against palpable injustice? Would not a man prefer being shot on the spot before he would tamely submit to see his honour and character thus lacerated with impunity?

Impartial reader, you see the punishments and humiliations I should undergo by attending these conferences; and you see also, the unjust degradation and heavy punishment inflicted for the crime of absence, of which the inflictor was himself the sole cause. The crime of omission was only punishable, according to the diocesan statutes, by a small fine, and that only when the omission was culpable. By this suspension, though uncanonical, there was a total stop put to all my pastoral functions and intercourse with my flock, which would alone entitle me to demand parochial dues, the means of my subsistence; and since the commencement of my persecutions until the period of my deprivation, there was a great deficiency in the temporal means of my support, and for some years I scarcely got any;—they were partly embezzled and taken up by several clergymen. I expect the Vicar will make restitution for all before he dies.

Under these insupportable trials, I made an appeal to the Archbishop of the Province, Dr. Troy, who refused to accept it, though in his situation it was imperative upon him to redress me; but he acted according to the tenets of the Inquisition—"The appeals of Heretics are not to be received." *See Constit. i. Inn. IV. head 7.*

When Dr. Troy refused to receive my

appeal, then for the first time (although Dr. Marum says in one of his charges preferred against me in Rome, that I was looking for redress by iniquitous machinations for twelve months before I appealed to Dr. Troy,) I applied to a lawyer for an advice in my extreme difficulties, who was of a decided opinion, that I could maintain an action of damages against Dr. Mansfield. I shewed this written opinion to Dr. Troy, and requested he would put a stop to the proceedings, by ordering my superior to reinstate me; he refused to comply, and desired I should go back to Kilkenny, and shew it to Dr. Marum, who was the Vicar General of the Diocese; when Dr. Marum read it, and saw it was the opinion of a protestant lawyer, he exclaimed, "Oh you consulted a protestant, and took his advice to take out an action against your spiritual superior; if you do so, you will incur an excommunication. Did you make a profession of faith, and take an oath of fidelity?"—(See this oath among the papal constitutions. The nature of said oath, is to support said constitutions, and observe and keep the system of the holy inquisition.) I made a candid declaration that I never took such an oath. I then went to Dr. Mansfield and handed him the opinion, and said I would immediately take legal proceedings if he would not reinstate me, and remove the Rev. Mr. Henebry, whom he thrust into my living contrary to the real canons of the church. Through dread of the law he complied. Notwithstanding, more severe and more iniquitous measures were substituted for the accomplishment of my ruin.

There was a strong door made for the Parish Chapel by the Rev. Mr. Henebry's directions, who had then the superintendency of said Chapel; this was fixed up, and the chapel nailed against me the following Sunday, together with the gate of the chapel-yard. The parish vestments were secreted: stations for Christmas and Easter prevented: no sacraments administered: masses and suffrages kept from the living and the dead; and many of the deceased interred without a christian burial. The people were left without a spiritual guide, without pastoral exhortations, and without any religious restraint. Was this the way to make the people loyal subjects and good christians? I need not intimate what dreadful effects followed—immorality, irregularity, and several other species of vice and dissipation were the natural results, and must always be wherever the inquisitorial system is directly or indirectly put in practice, as it was in the present instance.—The conduct of the clergy was the primary and ultimate cause of all.—It was then indeed the duty of the Vicar Capitular to use his influence and authority; to issue his censures, his prohibitions and interdictions, but like a party concerned he did neither; he permitted all with impunity, though his situation sub-gravi, required his immediate interference. *Qui tacet, consentire videtur.* Silence gives consent. "*Qui increpare delinquentes noluerit, eos proculdubio tacendo superior occidit,*" Greg. Pope. "The superior, who is unwilling to check the delinquent, most assuredly kills them by being silent;" yes, he kills their poor souls by encouragement,

connivance and approbation. For by the true law of the church, these clergy and laity who closed and fastened the chapel against the pastor, were ipso jure excommunicated.— They were also guilty of a capital crime by an Act of Parliament, called the Riot-boy Act. But the Inquisitors of the holy Tribunal will tell us, that their laws sanction the facts and annul the acts.

Things remained in this melancholy state until Dr. Marum was elected Bishop, to whom Dr. Mansfield consigned the business, in order that he might effect what he himself did not accomplish.

I had every expectation, on the eve of this appointment, that there would be a total end to all ecclesiastical censures, public scandals, and inquisitorial proceedings. This was the general wish and ardent desire of all the well-disposed and sound part of the community. But, alas! we were all frustrated in our expectations—avarice superseded justice: tyranny lenity, and the inquisition, divine and human legislation; in place of abolishing the diocesan tribunal of inquisitorial laws, he sanctioned the measures, supported the schemes, and upheld the system, by receiving the complaints, stimulating the desires, and executing the wishes of his diocesan inquisitors and faithful jurors. To shew and prove his zeal, he even anticipated the obligation of his episcopal oath of allegiance given to a foreign power, for the purpose of fighting against, and destroying heresy in his diocese. Dr. Mansfield informed me by letter, bearing date

30th November, 1814, that the Papal Bulls of Dr. Marum's consecration would be received at farthest in eight days' time through Dr. Murray of Dublin. On the 23d of February, 1815, I received the first note relative to this business from Dr. Marum.

*Kilkenny, 23d Feb. 1815.*

Rev. Sir—I am anxious to have some conversation with you on certain matters which materially interest not only yourself, but the portion of the Diocese under your care. Permit me, therefore, to request you will have the goodness to call on me here in the course of the next week; I should prefer an early day.

I am your humble servant,

K. MARUM.

*The Rev. L. Morrissy.*

I called according to request, and found the Doctor in the midst of his spiritual retreat for consecration, which took place on the following Sunday. Without much delay, he said that the purport of this interview was, that I should give him up my parish; I was astonished at this proposal, and asked the reason of the desired resignation. He said that he had received several charges from my parishioners against me, but that he would not tell me what they were—I pressed him to inform me; after repeated intreaties, he said that the principal complaints were, that I exposed my flock by insinuating from my altars, that they were implicated in treasonable practices against the constitution and laws of their country in the late

troubles in 1810, &c. in that neighborhood—and also the Catholic Religion, by publicly exposing and explaining the system of the Holy Inquisition in this country. I refused complying with this unreasonable and unjust demand of my living. He then positively declared that he would consult his chapter, (who are bound by the present ecclesiastical law to keep the tenets of the Holy Inquisition,) and some more of his clergy, and would deprive me of my benefice if they would advise it. He foresaw the decision.

I was greatly disappointed with respect to this personal interview, in my expectations of immediate reformation of past abuses, amelioration of ecclesiastical government, restoration of peace, opening of the chapels for divine service, administration of sacraments, conferring of ecclesiastical rites, and paying the last tribute of devotion and respect to the deceased by christian burial, &c. &c.

I was sincerely sorry to find that the bishop elect made my parish one of his choicest subjects of meditation in his spiritual retreat for episcopal promotion: and more so to see that the affections produced were Spanish Inquisitorial principles; and the resolutions formed, the destruction of Heresy, and abettors of Protestantism. This subject was well digested; for we were about two hours and a half treating of it; and in the interim, his cousin, the Rev. Mr. Carroll (who was aspiring after the parish) was listening with hypocritical ears in a back room, waiting to hear the result. From that day to the period of my parochial deprivation,

Dr. Marum never ceased encouraging informers, devising plans, and inflicting inquisitorial and self-created suspensions and interdictions until he accomplished his object.

The newly created Bishop of Ossory, mindful of his oath of allegiance to the Roman Pontiffs, and fidelity to execute the decrees of general and particular Councils, and to purge his Diocese of heretical pravity, (*salvo suo ordine*) “as far as he could with safety to himself,” &c. began his inquisitorial administration immediately after his consecration. He served his clergy with notice to attend conferences in different parts of the Diocese over which he was to preside in person. The first meeting of the clergy on this occasion was held in Knocktopher, County Kilkenny, on the 8th of May, 1815. At this conference he told them, that such of the beneficed clergy as did not make a profession of faith (in which are included the oath and tenets already described) within two months after their promotion, could be deprived of their parochial dues. According to the present mode of ecclesiastical legislation, and especially after getting this warning, they were bound to appear before his lordship, and bind themselves, *by a solemn oath*, to become ministers of the Holy Inquisition, as well as of the Holy Gospel.

In these printed conferences he asked his clergy, “*Quænam sit Hæresis definitio et divisio? Quænam sunt pænæ contra Hereticos latæ?*” — “What is the definition and division of Heresy? What punishments are enacted against Heretics?” If you wish to know the

punishments, gentle reader, see the Constitutions of Innocent IV. John XXII. Martin V. &c. as above. If the clerical gentlemen did not antecedently know the nature and design of these Papal laws and decretals of Councils, &c. the presiding Doctor of the holy tribunal was to explain the nature and enforce the obligations enjoined by them. The following year, 1816, a certain Archbishop sanctioned the edition of the Bible in the English language, and appointed a clergyman of an inquisitorial order to revise it, conformable to the tenets of the profession and obligation of them both. It appeared in the notes of this version of the Bible "that it is lawful to kill Heretics." When this horrid doctrine was taken notice of in the public prints, the prelate then, indeed, and only then, disavowed, by a public document, having any knowledge of, or encouraging such an abominable system, and ordered the clergy of his diocese to forbid their flocks to read it. May I ask his lordship, how could he be ignorant of this doctrine that he is obliged to know and learn, at least after his consecration, and even put in practise occasionally, under pain of excommunication? &c. Does not his library teem with such doctrines? Can he read scarcely any modern author on the canon law without seeing the same system of horror, bloodshed, and desolation embodied and inculcated? How can his Grace prohibit the dissemination, reading and practice of the law he is bound by an oath, and under pain of incurring heavy censures to support and inculcate? Nothing could sanction and excuse such disavowals, such de-



clarations and prohibitions, but *sound policy* to cloak perfidy, in order to destroy Heresy. This dissimulating conduct brings to my recollection an advice I got some time ago from a brother clergyman, to adopt a system which he himself followed and would recommend to all Roman Catholic clergymen, to expel Heretics and banish Anti-catholics from Irish ground, viz. “Not to allow Roman Catholics, if possible, to marry Protestants, to sell to, or buy from them, nor to employ them on any occasion, or negotiate with them,” &c. This very man has been lately consecrated bishop, and sent to a foreign clime to establish the Inquisition there!

One of the holy Prelates, before-mentioned, studied in the cradle which gave birth to the Holy Inquisition; the second, in the university which taught the baneful doctrine, and inculcated the diabolical principle already described; and the third in the city of ———, where many of the clergy and laity imbrued their hands in human blood, and constructed instruments of torture in compliance with the cruel edicts and detestable orders of their spiritual and temporal superiors.

After producing so many living examples, can any man endowed with common reason assert, that the tenets and laws of this forum are antiquated, and do not still operate, even in Ireland? If they are antiquated and abrogated, why are the oaths above described taken at every consecration, at preferments, &c.?—Why are these laws proposed, discussed and taught? Why are clergy and laity punished

and persecuted according to the dictates of its inexorable system, &c.?

Dr. Marum at length determined to visit my parish, and hold confirmation there on the 19th of June, 1815. After delivering his instructions on the subject already specified to his clergy throughout the Diocese, and making the desired impression on the minds of many, as will appear in the course of these humble pages, the day before confirmation, the 18th, (Sunday) he said mass in my parish chapel, according to previous, public and unusual notice. There was a crowded congregation from the neighbouring Parishes, Diocese and Counties, in expectation of witnessing something extraordinary, in consequence of the deplorable state the parish was in for years before. After his Mass and exhortation, he retired into the vestry and breakfasted, and afterwards went into the chapel again to said congregation, (who waited for his return according to request). He, declared in a loud voice, "that he had several sheets in folio full of charges against the Rev. L. Morriſſy from his parishioners;" this he did without giving me any previous notice or any opportunity of defence. This general mode of defamation is the most injurious that can be adopted, as it makes the deepest impression. I was present before the great crowds assembled in the chapel. In consequence of this unwarrantable attack, and the public and responsible situation I filled, I considered I was bound in justice to the people over whom I presided, and in vindication of my honour and moral character, to make a simple declaration of my innocence, before strangers in particular, whom I

would never again have the same opportunity of addressing and convincing, &c. In consequence of these reasons, and malignant attacks, I spoke as follows: "My Lord, I consider myself innocent of those charges, whatever they may be." The Bishop instantaneously stamped on the altar, and said, he would immediately suspend me if I did not hold my tongue; I said again, "My Lord, I consider that I am bound in duty to make a public declaration of my innocence before the vast concourse of people assembled here from all quarters; but I revere you as my bishop." I said no more, as many could witness. His Lordship proceeded, and said, "he would, on the 10th July following, have a court in Kilkenny, composed of some of his clergymen, to judge and decide, and treat me according to their opinion and decision on the subject in question, and that he would make the declaration of my innocence an additional charge!" After announcing his inquisitorial court, he introduced his familiar, the Rev. Mr. Carroll, whom he had obtruded into my parish as an Inquisitor, contrary to the ecclesiastical law, as I will prove on a subsequent occasion, and gave him full faculties therein, without any necessity, as the Parish Priest and Coadjutor were adequate to the labours and duties annexed to it. The Doctor warned the people to be kind to and entertain Mr. Carroll, who was, by appointment, to go through the parish and collect in writing all the charges and complaints they could furnish him with, to bring before the judges on the day of the investigation in Kilkenny. He repeatedly warned the parishioners to give all the in-

formation they possibly could against me. This faithful officer of the holy tribunal was not satisfied with all the charges he himself got and collected from those he encouraged and stimulated on the occasion, and preferred publicly against me, but to leave no stone unturned he must employ a public censor, &c. All the above charges to Carroll and the people were enjoined by the Bishop according to the tenets of the Papal constitutions and principles of the holy court, and they would be excommunicated did they not comply. There was, however, no difficulty with respect to the zealous inquisitor, who was fully confident of enjoying the parish himself, as soon as the Heretic could be banished.

I called on his lordship, in the presence of the said Rev. Mr. Carroll, to furnish me with a copy of the charges he publicly preferred against me in my parish Chapel; he said he would not, but would do whatever he should think proper, and nothing else. Now, after the expiration of six or seven months, the Bishop did what was imperative on him to do in the commencement of his episcopal authority; he opens the parish Chapel indeed, but how? and for whom? contrary to custom, order, and the law of the Church, he prohibits me in Mr. Carroll's presence to celebrate Mass in my parish Chapel of Templeorum, and that, before I was suspended by himself, or even under any private or apparent censures; and, to the astonishment and scandal of almost every person in the community, he opens said Chapel for those who shut it up, and who thereby incurred, *ipso jure*, an excommunica-

tion, according to many Councils, besides being guilty of a crime against the law of the land for which they could be capitally punished by the civil power. Yes, and without checking or punishing the perpetrators. Thus he gratified the guilty and punished the innocent; admitted the inquisitor into the tabernacle, and excluded the loyal and independent man. After staining and taking away as much as he could, my character, on the 18th of June 1815, after confirming the children of my parish, and dining with me, in company with the neighbouring clergymen on the 19th, and after prohibiting me to officiate in my parish chapel, and appointing another priest to fill my situation there, on the 20th of said month, he (the Bishop) left me the following commands, with the subjoined suspension, in case of non-compliance.

“Rev. Sir—When we were making our visitation in the parish chapel of Oning, you, without shame, interrupted us at the time of Mass, in preaching to the people; we commanded silence under pain of immediate suspension, but you refused to comply, therefore we strictly command you, by these presents, to acknowledge next Sunday, 25th of this month, your grievous crime in a loud voice, both in English and Irish, and in Mass, before the Rev. Nicholas Carroll, and all the people in the congregation, and declare your sincere sorrow publicly before all for the crime you committed. By this means you may perhaps remove in some measure this great scandal you gave, and obtain pardon from the Almighty God. Also, during my visitation you did not shew me the

reverence that is due to me. Now to suppress that barefaced and shameless conduct, and to preserve that ecclesiastical discipline supported by divine right, I shall consult my chapter, and proceed as we deem proper. Again, we order you to make the reparation required, and by no means to neglect it, and in case you should presume to neglect to do so, at the time appointed, hold yourself immediately suspended from order and office. *Given in the Parish of Oning, 20th June, 1815.*

**KYRAN, Bishop of Ossory!!!**

*By the mandate of our most illustrious  
and most Rev. our Lord, the Lord Bishop!!!*

**NICHOLAS CARROLL, Notary!!!**

Who could be silent, thus attacked and unwarrantably commanded to listen with impunity to his condemnation without previous notice or citation, without the process of legal or canonical proceedings, or permission to call on any of my flock, among said congregation, to give testimony in my favour? I was punished by my merciful and lenient judges, with a severe censure, for making a declaration of my innocence, (the answer always given to the first question asked at any Bar.) I was told by many intelligent men and good Divines, and even by one of the Cardinals in Rome, in the presence of one of the Canons of the Church, "that it was Doctor Marum himself gave the scandal he so vehemently inveighs against, and that he is the only person bound to make the reparation required."

Whereas Doctor Marum refused my personal application for the charges he preferred against

me before the public, I made the second application in writing, in order to prepare for the investigation—as follows :

*Oning, 14th July, 1815.*

My Lord—I humbly request you will give me a copy of the charges I am, or will be impeached with, and that are, or will be reported to you against me, and also time and place for each of those *charges*. I am, my Lord, your most obedient and humble servant,

*LAURENCE MORRISSY.*

*The Rt. Rev. Dr. Marum, Kilkenny.*

To this there was no answer given, or charges sent, then or at any other time.

There is a spurious law in our church that empowers Bishops to condemn and degrade Priests, without assigning any reason or reasons for doing so. Dr. Marum has told me that it is sufficient grounds for a Bishop to proceed against a clergyman and suspend him for ever, if he thinks in his own mind that he is right, without assigning any reason.

The appointed day of trial was rapidly approaching; I was in a compleat dilemma how to act without the knowledge of the charges, the advantage of witnesses, or any other auxiliary means, allowed the greatest culprit on the day appointed for the investigation of his conduct, and decision of his future fate. At length I formed a resolution of going to this partial trial, listening to the charges preferred, and calling for an adjournment, and a legal and canonical mode of proceeding. This favour was denied. At my arrival in Kilkenny,

Dr. Marum asked me abruptly, where I was going, I made reply, and said, "My Lord, I came to my trial," the Bishop exclaimed, "SIR, YOU ARE NOT TO BE AT YOUR TRIAL, OR ANY PERSON FOR YOU, OR BEARING EVIDENCE IN YOUR FAVOUR, ON THIS DAY OR ANY OTHER DAY YOU WILL BE TRIED; YOU MAY GO HOME, WE WILL DO THE BUSINESS OURSELVES WITHOUT YOU, &c.!!!" I was obliged to withdraw. He summoned to this holy tribunal, erected in his own house, the principal Inquisitors in his chapter, and the principal enemies I had among the clergy, to bear testimony and decide my case, viz. The Rev. Doctor Mansfield, Vicar Capitular, who first attempted to degrade me and deprive me of my Benefice, by suspensions, &c. &c. as before noticed—the Rev. Michael Forestall, Parish Priest of Callan, who suspended me in his vibrating transcurtion without matter or form—the Rev. Mr. Grady, P. P. of Freshford—the Rev. Mr. Carroll, P. P. of Inistiogue—the Rev. John Fitzpatrick, P. P. of Moncoyne—the Rev. Nicholas Carroll, P. P. of Ballyragget—the Rev. Mr. Quinlan—several of the Curates I had then and before, viz. the Rev. Messrs. Grant, Butler, Henebry, Mansfield, and a Dominican Friar; many of these Rev. Gentlemen were gaping after my good and fat living, and of course more desirous of my ruin.

His lordship called on the Rev. John Fitzpatrick, my next-door neighbour, and first asked his opinion on the occasion; who frankly and candidly said, 'that the foundation stone of Templeorum Chapel was laid in downright



opposition to Mr. Morrissy, and that he, from his intimate knowledge and proximate acquaintance with all the circumstances relative to the business in agitation from its commencement, unequivocally believed him to be an injured man, and that he, Mr. Morrissy, was capable of, and would make a good mission, there, or in any other part of the diocese. This honest and candid priest was immediately expelled the inquisitorial court, and no other man followed his example! The following day he called on me, 20th July, 1815, on his return from Kilkenny, and informed me of this transaction, &c. The rest of the judges and inquisitors sat in court, and condemned me, exactly according to the rules and laws prescribed by the holy inquisition, viz. to a perpetual privation of ecclesiastical living and clerical functions, and appointed another to my parish, without a hearing, without witnesses, and without an evidence in my favour, either in writing or by verbal information!!

I need not inform the intelligent reader, that this meeting was illegally convened, the proceedings contrary to every well prescribed form of law, and the sentence passed, not only illegal, but invalid. The laws of every well organized and regular state, do not recognize, but abhor such encroachments on human happiness, and civil society. The just and pure ecclesiastical law of the first ages of the church, likewise inveighs against and anathematizes them. P. Gregory says, "*Conspiratores in nullius accusatione sunt recipiendi, nec eorum vox ullum nocere vel accusare*

*potest.*" "Conspirators cannot be received as accusers, neither can their testimony hurt or tend to criminate another." Dec. can. 3. 24. cap. 5. "*Inimici accusatores vel testes esse non possunt.*" "A man's enemies cannot become his accusers or witnesses." Notwithstanding these canons, it is well known by the steps taken, that my accusers and judges were my declared enemies.

There are many things necessary to constitute a trial and make it lawful and valid. Pope Fabian says, "There should be judges elect, proper accusers, fit defenders, and legitimate witnesses; there should be a citation, there should be a crime established and legally proved by a regular and canonical process of ecclesiastical law." Are any of these essential conditions to be found in this Roman Catholic ecclesiastical court, inquisitorially held in the bishop's house, by which I was deprived and stripped of all I possessed in this world, both spiritual and temporal, and doomed to eternal woe!—Nevertheless, of this arbitrary, cruel, and uncanonical mode of proceeding and passing a definitive but invalid sentence did the members of the Holy Inquisition in Rome approve! and of which approbation, our Irish abettors of that holy tribunal, boast so much. More on this point, in its proper place.—"Pope Eleutherius says, "*Caveant iudices ecclesiæ ne absente eo cujus causa ventilatur, sententiam proferunt quia irrita erit, etiam in Synodo.*" "Let ecclesiastical judges take care not to pronounce sentence in the absence of the man whose cause is agitated, otherwise the sentence shall

be null, though given in a Synod." Pope Gregory asserts, "*Viribus sententia caret injuste, prolata,*" that is, "A sentence unjustly pronounced is of no effect." Pope Calixtus wrote to bishop Benedict, and said, "*Injustum judicium, et definitio injusta, aut cujus-cunq episcopi aut potentis, a judicibus ordinata non valet.*" "An unjust judgment, and an unjust sentence of any bishop or potentate, &c. is invalid." I am sure I need not quote any more authority, to shew and prove the illegality and invalidity of the sentence passed in the inquisitorial court of the diocese of Ossory.

I might be asked whether there are any ecclesiastical punishments and censures annexed to such glaring injustice. I shall at present content myself by quoting one of the general councils on this occasion, "*Si quem clericorum quacunque dignitate, &c.*" "If any of the clergy of any dignity or authority in the church shall presume, either by himself or other clergymen, or any other description of people, through art or deceit, force or dread, or under any other colour whatsoever, to convert to his own use, and monopolize the fruits, emoluments, rights, jurisdictions, &c. of any secular or regular benefices, and prevent those who possess and have a right to enjoy them, and use the same, he is anathematized, and remains under the same censure until he makes restitution for the entire, and shall afterwards obtain absolution from the Pope; besides he is to be deprived of his benefice, if he has any, and rendered incapable of obtaining any other." Let those who deprived me of my ecclesiastical benefice and spiritual functions, and those,

who were, in any respect, accessory to it, consider in time, that they have, without possibility of excuse, incurred this heavy censure prescribed by the council of Trent, and the indispensable obligation of an immediate restitution in full of all emoluments, fruits, &c. from the first day to the period of full atonement, &c. I may add,

St. Augustin and St. Gregory affirm, "that all proceedings of bishops against priests who have not been impartially convicted, *ipsis presentibus*, in their own presence, are marked as abominations in the eyes of God, are null and void, and can produce no effect." The decision of these two saints, Pope and Bishop, evidently prove and shew that the proceedings taken and adopted against me, are not only null and invalid in the eyes of God and man, but also require an immediate reparation here, or repentance without end.

Can I offer any better apology for the vindication of my character, than thus to lay before a discerning public, the mode resorted to for my degradation, and the sort of tribunal appointed for my condemnation.

Could it be imagined for a moment, that my adversaries would hesitate to proceed against me according to the order and form prescribed, either by the divine, ecclesiastical or civil law, could they but establish a crime adequate to the temporal and spiritual punishments inflicted? Could it be possible, that they would have taken so many illegal and uncanonical steps, could they legally and canonically proceed? But their views and pro-

ceedings have transcended above all laws and human feelings !!!

When I again, previous to my degradation, began to explain the nature of true loyalty and sincere fidelity to my flock, not only by inculcating how loyalty should be strictly kept and truly observed, but also by informing them of the injustice and cruelty of these constitutions and decrees which are unhappily established against it, and impressing a thorough idea of the indispensable obligation of every subject of all denominations to disavow and reprobate such laws and constitutions; I was immediately suspended, and my chapels were closed against me, under different pretexts, quite foreign from the point in view.

In like manner would his Majesty's Jails and Bridewells in the city of Dublin be now closed up and no admittance given, if the *inquisitorial system* could be put in force here with as much facility and impunity as it was in Oning and Templeorum, for similar purposes and hidden motives, under feigned insinuations of censures incurred and subsequent incapacities, in order to prevent all *legislative interference and Grand Jury appointments*. The various objections now made to my present appointment to his Majesty's prisons, &c. and to the exercise of clerical duties and pastoral functions in that situation, shall in due time be minutely answered and satisfactorily refuted.

#### END OF THE FIRST PART.

\*.\* Preparing for the Press, and will shortly appear, the continuation of the foregoing work.

*J. L. L. L.*

THE  
**SECOND PART**  
OF A  
DEVELOPEMENT  
OF  
*THE CRUEL AND DANGEROUS*  
**INQUISITORIAL SYSTEM**  
OF  
**The Court of Rome**  
IN  
**IRELAND,**

*And of its particular Operations in the Case of the Author,*

**THE REV. L. MORRISSY,**

Parish Priest of ORIN~ and TEMPLEORUM, in the Diocess of Ossory and  
County of Kilkenny, and Roman Catholic Chaplain to  
His Majesty's Prisons in Dublin.

~~~~~  
"Subditi vitia *Prelatorum* reprehendere student."

"Let Subjects be particular in reprehending the *vices* and *correcting*
the abuses of *Prelates*."—POPE GREG. XIII.



Dublin :

Printed for C. P. ARCHER, Bookseller to His Majesty,

And sold by M. Watson, 2, Capel-street; M. Keene, 6, College-green,
R. M. Tims, Grafton-street; J. O. Bonsall, Dawson-street;
La Grange, Nassau-street; C. Bentham, Eustace-
street, and Burnside, Capel-st.

1822.

110. i. 197. (2)

The Author has to claim the indulgence of the judicious reader for the errors here noted down, or any other, which might escape his notice. The distance at which he lived from the Printing Office, and his different avocations (which rendered his attendance to the Press impracticable,) together with the Printer's neglect in correcting typographical errors, will, he trusts, be a sufficient apology.

ERRATA.

Page 5, line 25, *for intolerent read intolerant*—p. 9, l. 30, *for sustinire read sustinere*—ibid. l. 31, *for majus read magis*—p. 13, l. 15, *for flock read flock*—p. 33, l. 5, *for St. read St.*—p. 39, l. 35, *for intellect read intellect*—p. 45, l. 29, *for censures read censures*—p. 48, l. 11, *for acknowledgments read acknowledgments*—ibid. l. 15, *for antimonarchical read antimonarchical*—p. 47, l. 26, *for stripeld read stripped*—p. 57, l. 29, *put Do. between Revdo. and Carroll*—p. 66, l. 9, *for althority read authority*—p. 75, l. 25, *for reteniri read retinere*—p. 85, l. 19, *for debared read debarrd*—p. 91, l. 22, *insert the between in and presence*—p. 94, l. 5, *for diocemes read dioceses*—p. 96, l. 3, *for prefered read preferred*—p. 99, l. 33, *for might read would*—p. 106, l. 16, *for notwithstanding read notwithstanding*—p. 104, l. 33, *for enbject read subject*—ibid. l. 34, *for instret read interest*—p. 109, l. 7, *for agreomor read aggreomor*—p. 111, l. 31, *for chage read change*—p. 113, l. 11, *for explicitelty read explicitly*—ibid. l. 20, *for confared read conferred*—p. 114, l. 25, *for alnded read allnded*—p. 115, l. 1, *for befoe read before*—p. 117, l. 33, *for ignominous read ignominious*—p. 125, l. 2, *for Chatholic read Catholic*—p. 132, l. 6, *for nurstenders read nursetenders*—p. 135, l. 7, *for threatened read treated*—p. 136, l. 9, *for encrease read increase*—p. 135, l. 29, *for inquisitorial read inquisitorial*—p. 147, l. 3, *for whoze read whose*—p. 156, l. 33, *for sa read as*—p. 173, l. 33, *for principle read principal*—p. 156, l. 8, *for the read that*—p. 159, l. 15, *for anarchial read anarchical*—p. 255, l. 34, *for can read are*.

A

BRIEF STATEMENT,

&c.

PART II.

THE painful result arising from the proceedings of the inquisitorial court established in the diocese of Ossory, and already described in the first part of my statement of personal injuries, and unrelenting persecutions, may be best known by the following suspension and subsequent appointment of a mercenary intruder.

Kilkenny, 20th July, 1815.

“REV. SIR—I delivered into your hands on Tuesday, 20th June last, a letter containing my positive command, that you should, on the ensuing Sunday, 25th June, publicly acknowledge your fault in the chapel of Oning, and express your sorrow for the shameful extremity to which you had allowed yourself to be hurried. This most just command you disobeyed. Since that period you have for many days absented yourself from the parishes

B

which were under your care. You have also absented yourself from the conference on cases of conscience, held in Knoctopher, on the 3d of the present July; and finally, you have suffered an entire month to pass by without offering any excuse or apology for this most unprecedented and unwarrantable conduct. Therefore, for the causes mentioned above, I do hereby suspend you from the exercise of Holy Orders, and withdraw from you all spiritual jurisdiction, during the space of three months, to be reckoned from the day of the date hereof. I also prohibit you to exact or receive (during the aforesaid three months) from the faithful of Oning or Templeorum, any of the voluntary contributions, known by the name of parochial dues. And further, I expressly prohibit you to resume (even at the expiration of the three months specified) the exercise of Holy Orders, or spiritual functions, until you shall have *first* presented *yourself* to me, and humbly *solicited permission* so to do, and shall have received, with becoming docility, the instructions and admonitions which I shall then deem it my duty to furnish.

“ KYRAN MARUM, R. C. Bishop of Ossory.”

To the Rev. Lawrence Morrisy, Oning.

I have before declared my sentiments, and given my reasons for not obeying this positive and unjustifiable command, “to acknowledge guilt,” where there was no crime—and, “express sorrow,” where there was no cause

for sorrow. His second charge in this letter is, "that I absented myself from the parish for several days:" behold the absurdity and illegality of this charge, and feigned cause of additional punishments and repeated suspensions. I had been already prohibited, in his former letter, under pain of suspension, to exercise *clerical duties*, and *discharge pastoral functions*; and he, in the interim, appointed another Priest (his own relative) in my place, to perform these sacred obligations peculiar to my own situation; and thus rendered me a mere cypher in the parish. How could I promote the spiritual welfare of my flock, or what advantage could be derived by my presence, in the *degraded state* he left me in? For, I was prevented from administering any spiritual aid, and the people were prohibited from making application to their proper pastor on parochial occasions: therefore, in this shackled state, I might as well have chosen my abode with Enoch and Elijah for the moment!!! From the nature of these futile accusations and unjust grounds of inflicting more intolerant censures, he would give to understand, that he was actuated by the *following motives*:—

1. To mortify me more and more by remaining under the immediate inspection and absolute controul of his *inquisitorial agents*.

2. To prevent the dissemination of his cruelty and oppression outside the limits of his episcopal jurisdiction.

And, 3. To remove every opportunity of

making appeals, and seeking redress by personal applications.

The cause of my alleged absence from my parish was, the appealing a second time in person to the Metropolitan, Doctor Troy, who again abruptly refused to receive my appeal, in compliance with the tenets of the inquisitorial constitutions, "*let not the appeals of heretics be received.*" Immediately after this refusal, I made application to the Primate of all Ireland, Doctor O'Reilly, of Drogheda, who likewise refused to receive my appeal on the same principle, and referred me back to the same tribunal. Thus was I ignominiously treated and inhumanly rejected by the abettors and supporters of inquisitorial legislation, for the abolition of heretical depravity. His Lordship sorely complains, "that I suffered an entire month to pass without making any apology for my conduct," to which I was by no law, religion, or reason bound. And now almost six years have elapsed since he incurred the indispensable obligation of making the reparation of my character and restitution of my property; to which he is still bound, and always will be, according to the laws of the church, the decision of learned divines and intelligent men, until the necessary atonement shall be fully made. For the causes above specified, (I should rather say, for the pretexts above devised,) the Bishop suspended me for the space of three months, and prohibited me to receive any parochial dues, or re-assume any spiritual functions, even at the expiration of

said three months, until I should abide by whatever instructions and admonitions he would deem proper to furnish me with ; which were predicted by his clerical *partial jury* in the following sentence, uncanonically given in the inquisitorial court, held in his own house in Kilkenny : “ *A perpetual privation of his ecclesiastical benefice, ecclesiastical property, and exclusion from all ecclesiastical preferment ; according to the tenets and regulations prescribed by the ministers and judges of the holy inquisition.*” Why then was not this privation of spiritual rights, exclusion from ecclesiastical preferment, and spoliation of temporal property, perpetually pronounced in his suspension, instead of three months, according to the decision given ? the reasons are quite obvious !!!

1st. If a perpetual suspension of spiritual faculties, &c. were immediately and unconditionally inflicted, the alarm would be terrific—the suspended and despoiled would be roused to animadvert and seek immediate redress.

2d. The public would be scandalized, and heap bitter invectives on the guilty heads of those who devised the horrid measures, and executed the baneful deeds.

3d. The inquisitorial system might be finally discovered and ultimately prevented, (if not punished) by the interference of civil authorities. And finally, the last prohibition in his code of censures, “ I expressly prohibit you to exercise, &c. until you shall have presented yourself and receive, with docility,

my instructions, &c." was tantamount to a perpetual deprivation, expulsion, &c.—since they were fully aware, that the instructions and admonitions alluded to, would never be received and complied with by any, except by a parasite who would tamely yield, and become a member of the *holy society*. Hence, it was considered advisable to issue these suspensions and prohibitions by piece-meal, and under certain conditions, for the reasons already specified.

On Saturday, 22d July, after the above court was held, he delivered into my hands this jumble of spurious censures; and on the following day, 23d of said month, came to my *altar* and introduced to my flock a friend of his, the Rev. Mr. Cody, as their parish priest, whom he appointed in my place, and requested they would call on him in future on all ecclesiastical occasions, and pay him alone all the parochial dues and emoluments. The Bishop publicly declared, "that he made this *change and arrangement* according to the *advice and decision* of the *clergymen* he *summoned* on the *occasion*." In consequence of this unjust and uncanonical intrusion, all parochial applications, usually made to me, ceased; all parochial dues were withdrawn, and all the means of my temporal existence and spiritual life withheld. Such laws were never revealed by God to his church, or sanctioned by any authority in this country, either civil or ecclesiastical. Jesus Christ never gave the power of destruction or usurpation to the ministers and prelates of his church;

neither did he grant them the power of binding any man before God, who does not first bind himself by actual sin, and voluntary transgression of the divine law. Let bishops abandon and abhor the spurious and unsufferable canons of the iniquitous inquisition, and adhere to the apostolic and equitable canons of the universal church.

“Sicuti beneficiatus a suo beneficio deponi, aut in ejus pacifica possessione impediri vel perturbari nequit, nisi ex justa et canonica causa, idque servato juris ordine; ita nec a functionibus beneficio annexis suspendi potest, nisi justa de causa, ac servato juris ordine; sive hæc suspensio infligatur per modum pœnæ, sive per modum censuræ.” V. Espin. cap. x.

“As a beneficed clergyman cannot be deposed, or deprived of his benefice, or impeded or disturbed in the peaceable possession thereof, unless for a just and canonical cause, and that by observing the order prescribed by the canonical law; neither can he be suspended from the discharge of the functions annexed to his benefice, unless for a just cause, and by adhering to the order prescribed by the law, also; whether this suspension be inflicted by way of punishment, or by way of censure.” Ibid.

“Non debet is pœnam sustinire canonicam in cujus damnatione non est canonica prolata sententia.”—St. Greg. chap. 64.

“A man who is uncanonically condemned, should not suffer any canonical punishment.”

Did Doctor Maruin observe this canonical

doctrine, prescribed by the Head of the Church, able canonists, and general councils? Certainly not! for he served me with no citation—he admitted no witnesses in vindication of my character—permitted no advocates—established no canonical crime—and refused my personal appearance, &c.; all being necessary conditions for the legality and validity of a definitive sentence.

By virtue of the above laws and canons, there are two things absolutely prohibited, viz. the spoliation of ecclesiastical property, and, the suspension of pastoral functions.—Notwithstanding, the Prelate despised the sacred canons, and gratified his predominant inclinations; and of course his censures and prohibitions were uncanonical and invalid, and by no means binding; still, (for peace sake) I observed them inviolate, for the three months prescribed in his letter.

To prove that I was at liberty to act in defiance of the suspension inflicted, I shall quote the subsequent authority:—

“Pastor qui per suspensionem, non servato juris ordine, latam afflicto fuit, nequaquam per illam, ut falso semper supponitur, officio pastoralis aut jure exercendi functiones ab ea cura animarum dependentes privatus fuit, aut privari potuit; cum talis censura, meré constans, *via facti*, prorsus nulla sit et nullius effectus. Non enim majus licet Episcopo, aut judici ecclesiastico, per ejusmodi censuram turbare Pastorem in pacifica possessione, quam id liceat cuivis alteri per quamvis aliam violentiam.” V. Espin.

• A Pastor, who has been afflicted by a suspension, pronounced contrary to the order of the law, neither has been, or can be, as is always falsely and ignorantly supposed, deprived by it of his pastoral office, or of the right of exercising the functions annexed to the care of souls, whereas such a censure, evidently tyrannical, is altogether void and of no effect. For it is not more lawful for a Bishop, or an Ecclesiastical Judge, by such a censure, to disturb the Pastor in his peaceable possession, than it is for any other individual, by any other violence or molestation."

Pope Innocent III. said, "Non est tenenda, imo nec timenda censura, si contineat errorem intolerabilem."—"A censure which contains an intolerable error, is not to be kept, or even to be dreaded."

Now it is clearly evident that the above *censures*, &c. contain such an error as the Pope mentioned—contain every thing that is degrading, abusive, and intolerant in life—the loss of property, fame and character, of the fond caresses of friends and relatives, and, in a great measure, of life itself, in consequence of withdrawing the necessary means of preserving it, and preventing all succours, whereby a man may prolong his days to the period destined by Divine Providence for his dissolution;—as banishment, confinement, or instantaneous death, cannot be inflicted or allowed by our glorious constitution, still other means, almost tantamount to these *inquisitorial edicts*, are adopted by the judges and ministers of the holy tribunal.

I made different applications, at different periods, to my Bishop, Doctor Marum, in order to effect, by every means consistent with reason, religion, and preservation of character, an amicable and honourable reconciliation ; but could not by any possibility accomplish that desirable object, without criminalizing myself publicly by an unequivocal acknowledgment of grievous crimes ; though I had only made a public declaration of my innocence, when he unwarrantably and unmercifully announced, “ that he had a catalogue of charges against me ; ” without proving or substantiating one single accusation by trial or evidence, judge or jury.

On the 20th of October, 1815, after the expiration of the suspension inflicted for three months, I called on his Lordship to know whether he was then satisfied with the punishments already imposed and sufficiently condign, even in case of delinquency ; and would reinstate me, or make a provision for my subsistence ; his answer was, “ that he might do something for me, after performing the course of penance he would prescribe, and after a long trial of my conduct and reformation. This is, indeed, the most lenient treatment and mild proposal a judge of the holy court could offer to a depraved heretic ! But I may thank the British constitution for the lenity proposed, and mitigation of vital punishments. The penance required was,—“ that I should make a spiritual retreat for eight days in the diocesan academy of Burshfield, near Kilkenny :—that

I should not sit, eat, or drink,—have any intercourse to, or hold any conversation with the students there, &c.—that I should, after this retreat, go to confession to his inquisitorial penitentiary, and abide by the instructions and directions he would furnish me with—and finally, “that I should wait for, and expect his own will and pleasure with patience and resignation, in the disposal of my future destination, at all times and in all things.”

As the building of Templeorum chapel was a pretext for Doctor Mansfield to attempt to despoil and expel me from all pastoral functions, and ecclesiastical livings; and as the preaching of unfeigned loyalty to my flock, and application to a Protestant lawyer for a legal opinion against my spiritual superior, was a motive for Doctor Marum to try me by his *inquisitorial court*, and accomplish my final degradation and expulsion from all ecclesiastical preferment; so would the public acknowledgment of grievous crimes, for making a candid declaration of my innocence when treacherously attacked, be a sufficient justification for all the illegal and uncanonical proceedings taken against me by himself and the *partizans* of the Ossorian tribunal.

I shall briefly advert to the different degrading conditions proposed by my Bishop, whose insatiable thirst for punishing the object of his indignation, increased in proportion to my longanimity in sufferings, and repeated supplications for a release from spiritual privations, ecclesiastical shackles, and insupportable difficulties.

1. "That I should make a spiritual retreat for eight days," &c. From the end proposed by the church in the establishment of spiritual retreats, and the mode of discipline practised by universal custom, in the performance of this laudable exercise, it is quite manifest, that the end proposed by my superior, was not that prescribed by the Holy Fathers, and masters of a spiritual life. In all religious establishments, the entire community of every house make their annual spiritual retreat together for edification sake, excitement of mutual devotion, and improvement of moral virtues. The surest way of enjoying the divine presence of God himself, is to assemble together in ardent prayer, sublime meditations, and united supplications, "Wherever two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." Mat. viii. 20. In like manner, the diocesan spiritual retreat of the clergy, includes the entire body; the necessary number for attending and answering parochial calls being excepted. In this retreat, the talent, the virtue, and practical knowledge of the clerical body of the respective diocese are collected and united for the laudable purpose of atoning for past sins, by the voluntary infliction of corporal austerities, accompanied by a thorough change of the heart, and true repentance of the soul—of mutually instructing each other by spiritual lectures, devoutly read and emphatically inculcated—of preaching and teaching the pastoral obligations inseparably annexed to their respective situa-

tions in the ecclesiastical vineyard—of enlightening the understanding and inflaming the will by pathetic discourses, collected from the best authors, and sublime sentiments imbibed by previous study, impressed by profound meditations, and perhaps inspired by divine operations—and finally, preparing each individual to discharge the weighty task of pastoral duties and clerical functions; add to these powerful advantages, the efficacy of the prayers of the just in the eyes of God, who often listens to them in favour of the wicked, when he would reject their own petitions, and grants the grace of repentance to public sinners through the intercession of his chosen friends,—God said in reply to the prayer of Abraham, “If you find ten just men in the city of Sodom and Gomorrah, I will spare the rest,” &c. Gen. viii. 32. By this solitary retreat the Bishop pretended he would consult my feelings and change the sentence pronounced—of publicly announcing before a crowded congregation from my altar, the enormous crime and great scandal, &c. I gave by the declaration of my innocence, as before, on the day of his visitation in my parish; and insinuated, “that I might by this mode of penance obtain pardon, and be reconciled to an angry God, whose indignation I highly incurred by the insult offered himself for my presumption in making any apology to the public for the attack made on my character, in the chapel of Oning, as before specified. By changing the sentence and adopting the mode just now prescribed, it is

obvious that it was not my salvation or reconciliation he had in view, but his own justification in the abuse of power—his own palliation in his inquisitorial proceedings. A few weeks before this personal interview took place, he, by previous notice, and according to custom, assembled his clergy to make a spiritual retreat, and excluded me by giving no such notice, either in writing or by verbal information. Hence I was deprived of all the advantages of such retreats, as specified above. The infallible judge of heretical depravity, knew full well that the attending this retreat would not sufficiently designate the loyal man as a confirmed heretic, doing penance for his fidelity to heretical authority, and for disobedience to episcopal power when exerted in the suppression of liberality and toleration, or in the support of ecclesiastical tyranny, for the abolition of spreading heresy.

2. "That I should not sit, eat, or converse with the students and inmates of the academy." The mild and condescending minister of the holy and undivided tribunal, now in flattering terms, tells me, "that he will not insist on a public declaration of my guilt, as before required from my altar, in the presence of my parishioners, but that I should make the necessary reparation in solitude, within the precincts of a seminary." Yes! indeed, all very plausible terms to an unthinking man, implicitly attaching credit and paying blind obedience to subtle devices and adulating suggestions. This *private* mode of self-crimination would be more public, more

degrading; and more convincing than the former; for the acknowledgment of guilt, and expression of sorrow in *my own chapel*, before *my own congregation*, might not transpire much beyond the limits of *my own district* and the surrounding parishes; whereas the report of this *inquisitorial retreat* would *resound from the central point to the extremities of the land*; since students were assembled from all quarters in said academy, who would industriously inform their friends, in their respective places of residence, of the extraordinary and unusual retreat of the *refractory priest*—the *abettor of Heresy*. It would be more degrading—as it would naturally establish a perpetual degradation—for a clergyman to be segregated not only from his own equals, as before, but now from his inferiors in the course of this unprecedented retreat, and to be deprived of all human society in spirituals as well as in temporals—a *punishment not inflicted in the former mode*.—It would be more convincing—as an actual and voluntary severe course of penance would evince guilt and prove criminality more effectually than the bare declaration of facts, ever so extraneous, and inconsistent with truth and reason.

3. “That I should go to confession,” &c. To whom?—to a member of that tribunal which brought disgrace on religion, corrupted the morals of thousands, clergy and laity, and polluted the sanctuary, by the bloodshed of innocent victims,—the arrogance of self-created and destructive power; and the pro-

fanation of sacred rights and divine institutions—To whom?—to a man who might reveal my auricular confession, and commit a gross sacrilege. For the confirmation of this insinuation, or rather of the fact, I shall exhibit official documents from the respective tribunals of European and American Spain, to the Confessors belonging to their several districts, issued the 12th February, 1815, and sent to the regular and secular clergy, under the jurisdiction of that tribunal.

“Availing ourselves of the opportunity afforded us by the approach of Easter confession, commanded by a precept; and being desirous that the faithful may dispose themselves to fulfil that obligation worthily, we transmit adequate powers and instructions in those matters pertaining to the holy offices, to all secular and regular Confessors, approved of by the Diocesan Bishop, in order that they may be enabled to act towards, and direct those penitents who may have fallen into *heresy*, either external or mixed, according to the mode and form adopted and established by the holy office, hereby subjecting said Confessors to the following instructions:—

1. “Each of them is, with the greatest precaution and efficacy, to persuade his penitent to accuse himself, and to reveal to him all the errors and heresies into which he had or may have fallen, without promising to him the benefit of absolution on any other condition; assuring him of the inviolable secrecy he will keep, and which is kept in the holy office, and that no injury shall result to him; and that

this measure will rather serve as a means to prevent his being punished, in case he should be accused by any other person of the errors and heresies which it behoves him to manifest and make known to himself, to which he otherwise stands liable.

2. "In case the penitent should confess, the confessor shall take down his declarations and accusations under *oath* to speak the truth; and this act shall bear the following heading: "In the town of N. on such a day, month, and year, came before me, the under-signed confessor," (expressing his name, age, country, profession, and situation in life.) The document shall then relate, in a particular and specific manner, all his errors and heresies, and their accompanying circumstances, the time and place in which he had committed them, in which he had seen or heard them committed; and, if any persons were present, they are to be named, and he is also to specify all he knows of them. The penitent is to sign his own declaration, if he knows how; and if not, he is to make a cross; but the confessor is always to sign it.

3. "The confessor shall cause the penitent to abjure his heresy, and absolve him by reconciling him to the church: he shall moreover enjoin him to confess all his heretical errors, and impose on him such penance as he may deem fit; which being done, the whole is to be forwarded to the holy office.

"Finally, if the most efficacious persuasions did not prevail on the penitent, in case

he should evince due signs of repentance and detestation of his offences, the confessor shall absolve him from excommunication in the internal forum* only, explaining this to him for his government and information. As soon as the statement of all this has been drawn up by the confessor, he is also to forward it to the holy office,

“Our Lord preserve you many years, &c.
Inquisition of Seville, 12th February, 1815.

Dr. D. Francisco Rodriguez de Carasa.

Dr. D. Joaquin de Murcia Y. Eulate.

Licentiate D. Jose Maria Valenzuela.

By order of the holy office,

Br. D. Juan Jose, Verdugo, Secretary.”

In this anomalous period of the nineteenth century, in which we live, we have, alas! the misfortune of seeing our religion perverted various ways for political purposes; we have witnessed religious systems established for sinister motives; we have, with revolted feelings of comprehensive knowledge, beheld the sacred dispensations of heaven insidiously abused, and deceitfully administered by the hand of treachery. In the epoch of our temporal existence, we have seen the ministers of the altar solemnly employed to act the part of spies and informers—solemnly commissioned to prepare instruments of torture, and deeds of destruction for those who might approach the sacramental tribunal of confes-

* What is meant by this term is, that the confessor is allowed to reconcile the penitent to God, but not to exempt him from the prosecutions of the holy office.

sion, and disclose to them their exterior deeds, interior thoughts, and the inmost recesses of their hearts. A more treacherous and fascinating mode of securing innocent victims was never invented; a more dexterous and effectual method of ensnaring the incautious, and captivating the narrow minds of credulous dupes, was never established—"Qui habent aures audiant"—"Let those who have ears listen." The sacrament of penance, reconciliation and forgiveness, is now become a wide register, in the hands of avaricious and sacrilegious inquisitors, to discover the sentiments, the actions, and future conduct of their penitents; to put on record their names, professional pursuits and places of abode, in order to furnish a ready and infallible instrument of attainder against their persons, and those of their accomplices, advisers, instigators or abettors.

It appears now that auricular confession is no longer a secret with the ministers of the holy Inquisition, although bound under severe censures, to the observance of the most profound secrecy. The Roman Catholic is taught to believe that every priest is strictly bound by a triple precept not to violate the sigil of sacramental confession; viz. by a natural, divine, and ecclesiastical command. Hence this obligation cannot be dispensed with by any human or ecclesiastical power; it cannot be violated for any end or purpose, though ever so good, or ever so necessary; or for any spiritual or temporal consideration. Innocent III. in the IV.

Council of Lateran, enacted the following punishment against the violators of the sacramental sigil. His words are:—*Can. omnis retriusque serius. Caveat autem omnino sacerdos, ne verbo, aut signo, aut alio quovis modo aliquatenus prodeat peccatorem; sed si prudentiori concilio indiguerit, illud absque ulla expressione personæ caute requireret; quoniam qui peccatum in penitentiali iudicio sibi detectum presumpserit revelare, non solum a sacerdotali officio deponendum decernimus, verum etiam ad agendam perpetuam penitentiam in arctum monasterium detrudendum.*"

"Let the priest be particularly careful not to betray the sinner, on any account, either by word or sign, or in any way whatsoever; but, if he want to consult, let him ask counsel in the most cautious manner, without expressing the person's name; since we decree, that he who presumes to reveal the sin disclosed to him in the penitential tribunal, shall not only be deposed from the sacerdotal office, but also, shall be doomed to perpetual penance, within the precincts of a confined monastery."

The same Pope says—"that the clergyman who violates this precept, sins more grievously than the man who commits the fact." There is no way or pretext left the priest, to think or speak, directly or indirectly, of any thing he hears in confession, except in one solitary case, and that without naming the penitent, or divulging any sacramental knowledge acquired in said tribunal,—but by proposing

it as a simple case, for information sake, in order to direct the penitent, &c. For example, If a clergyman meets with a difficult case in confession, which he cannot immediately decide, according to the principles of morality and rules of justice, he is to defer the penitent, as the case may require the measure; he is bound to consult men and books on the occasion; otherwise he shall be responsible to God for misguiding the penitent, or for any spiritual or temporal loss he, or any other person, might suffer through his ignorance, or want of knowledge, &c. These difficulties, and obscure cases, often occur with respect to wedlocks, restitutions, and contracts. First, then, the priest should consult his books, and if the case in question could not be found, he should consult some prudent and learned divine, and propose his difficulties, in order to clear them up, and acquire the necessary information, without mentioning names, talking of sacramental tribunals, or insinuating any further motive. Whoever acts otherwise, subjects himself to the punishments and censures already described by the Council of Lateran, and Pope Pius III.

Notwithstanding all the natural, divine, and ecclesiastical prohibitions issued against the violation of this sacramental knowledge, and revelation of sacramental confessions, still, in our days, we see all laws, divine and human, transgressed by the ministers and supporters of this corrupt tribunal, in foreign countries and in our native island. We wit-

ness, by woeful experience, the officers and prelates of inquisitorial councils in different countries, authorizing and commanding confessors to reveal the sins and secrets of their penitents, for the treacherous purposes of machinating their destruction, and offering them up as holocausts on the altar of the iniquitous tribunal. The instructions given to confessors by the Spanish council, and the orders delivered by the Irish Prelate and avenger of heretical depravity, will shew the scheme and prove the measure.

1st. The above council orders the priest to persuade his penitent to accuse himself of all his errors and heresies, and to assure him that he (the priest) and the council, will keep all secret, and that no injury shall result to him, but rather that this measure will prevent his being punished, in case any other person should accuse him of the sins he confesses, and to which he stands otherwise liable. In this first instance, the seal of confession is violated in a variety of ways: for the priest, conformably to his orders, tells his penitent that he will reveal his confession to this temporal fallacious office, composed of clergy and laity; though being strictly bound to reveal it to no man on any account whatsoever, without the free and voluntary consent of the penitent, which is not here offered, but extorted by subtlety and flattery, and sometimes by menaces for base purposes and sinister motives.

2dly. His superiors order the confessor to take down the declarations of his penitent,

under *oath* to speak the truth; to insert in this document the day, month, and year he confessed; his name, age, country, and profession; his sins and their circumstances; also, the names of others who might be present, or commit the same; besides the poor penitent must sign this declaration—must sign his own condemnation—must make the secrets of his heart public to his *inveterate enemies*—must give the names and specify the sins of others, who were witnesses or accomplices, for their apprehension and punishment: the father confessor must sign this document also, and send it to be publicly examined by the court, and perhaps it might travel to head quarters—*Rome*.

Besides the indispensable obligation the priest is under not to reveal directly or indirectly the sins of his penitent, as I proved before, he is also strictly bound not to ask him the names of other persons, or accomplices:—the penitent, in like manner, is bound to mention no names, and in case the confessor finds him inclined to do so, he should immediately prevent such disclosures. All these divine rights, ecclesiastical restrictions, and natural obligations, are no longer a barrier to inquisitorial priests, furnished with dispensations, and actually ordered by ecclesiastical superiors, and lay-authorities, to disclose the sins, and make public the sacramental confessions of their penitents,—not to heal their souls, but to inflict temporal punishments on their bodies,—to take away their moral character, and bring disgrace on their posterity.

3rd. The father confessor will make his penitent, priest or laic, abjure his heresy, by disavowing his principles of loyalty and fidelity to heretical monarchy, &c. will absolve him from the excommunication he incurred, by being an abettor of heretics, in opposing the measures of the Holy Inquisition; he will reconcile him to the church, by binding him down to become a faithful member of the Holy Society, in co-operating with them in the abolition of heresy, by the massacre and banishment of all anti-Catholics; he shall impose suitable satisfaction, that the enormity of his crimes might be known to others by the weight of his sacramental penance. All things that pass between God, the confessor, and the penitent, are to be made known in the most unequivocal manner at court, &c.

Finally, if the confessor cannot prevail on his penitent to comply with all the above requisitions, he will subtly and intriguingly adopt sufficient means to induce the *dupe* to an immediate compliance; he will make use of flattering promises, and hold forth hopes of reconciliation with God; and in case of refusal, will excite alarms of future prosecutions by the ministers of the *holy office*. The penitent will be informed, that he shall receive absolution from the excommunication incurred by heresy: (although some rigid inquisitors will assure us, that such refusals will subject the recusants to an excommunication, from which they cannot be absolved during their obstinacy) but at the same time,

that he shall be left exposed at the discretion of the *court*, to treat him according to their laws and measures, who are bound by oaths, and inclined from principle, to punish him for non-compliance, &c. Then the poor penitent will become tremulous, will stand in great awe; thus confounded, thus perplexed by inquisitorial trammels, in the merciless hands of ferocious assassins and hired ministers. In this wretched situation, in this awful moment of vital decision, in all human probability he will comply with the wishes of the holy court, and instructions of his ghostly father, to save his own life, protect his family, and preserve his property; he will permit all to be disclosed sooner than forfeit all; he will give every information required sooner than permit his own condemnation and final execution.—Can such confessions be called holy, voluntary or remissible? can such extortions be called free acts of the will, which would only and cautiously sanction the disclosure of sacramental communications in the one solitary case already explained, but which is quite foreign from the subject now in question. The father confessor is to draw up a statement of all the above transactions which existed between himself and his penitent, and is carefully to forward it to the holy office. In like manner, should my father confessor (the penitentiary) forward my sacramental confession to the *Ossorian office*. The sigillum of sacramental confession was in primitive times ordered by bishops and superiors to be kept secret and inviolate, under pain of

severe punishments; but the same seal is now ordered to be broken by bishops and superiors, with promises of preferments and remunerations.

Now it is evident, from demonstrative proofs, that the tribunals of sacramental confession are by the ministers and advocates of the holy inquisition, perverted into temporal tribunals for discoveries, prosecutions and punishments. This sacred tribunal at length becomes the general receptacle of the general court to discover all things of a public and private nature, for sinister views and self-interest. In the same year, (1815) that the Spanish inquisition of Seville issued orders and gave directions for the discovery of heretical depravity and detection of heretical abettors, through the medium of sacramental confessions; *a similar tribunal was established in the diocese of Ossory, called a Penitentiary*, to which I was ordered to repair, and directed to confess, &c. as above.—To whom was I ordered to confess? to an inquisitor, to a member of the Sacerdotal Sanhedrim who condemned me without judge or jury, evidence or conviction; in a word, to a man who lived thirty miles from the place of my residence;—to a man who was himself under severe censures, and could not be absolved by any except the Pope alone, or some other person authorised by him: *Con. Trid.* Consequently, this religious zealot, together with his fraternal bigots, should be sent not only thirty miles from home, but some hundred leagues, in the character of transalpine con-

victs, to obtain absolution from the chief pontiff, for their unjust, uncanonical, and unmerciful conduct in the inquisitorial court of Ossory. May the Almighty God inspire them to form efficacious resolutions of amendment and atonement, as the author of the inquisition inspired them to despoil and dispossess the loyal man, and turn him out on the wide world in distress and misery. It is unnecessary to say, that I took particular care not to trust my head into, and endanger my soul in this penitentiary, out of which no honest man, loyal subject, or true penitent, could extricate himself unhurt and untainted.

The general opinion of Roman Catholics is, that priests do not think of, or recollect the sins they hear in confession, and, much less, talk of and relate them to others : but, with the greatest regret, I can assert the contrary, and prove the fact. The dispensations of the Spanish tribunals, and the instructions issued to European and American confessors, should suffice to prove and demonstrate the reality of sacramental disclosures, and sacramental abuses : however, as foreign examples will not always convince the Irish, without quoting some recent and domestic instances impressive of credulity ; I shall unquestionably put the subject matter beyond all doubts of probability. Some lay people informed me, that they heard several priests, in company, relating some sins of a delicate nature, of which said clergy acquired knowledge in the confessional, under the seal of

that sacred tribunal, at which they were greatly scandalized, but had not fortitude enough to reprimand, or sufficient knowledge to report them to their superiors, who ought to suspend them perpetually from their office. I have been myself present in company, at different times, where I witnessed priests revealing heinous sins sacramentally confessed to them. Some priests informed me (extra) without the least necessity, of most enormous crimes they heard in confession, perpetrated between * * * * *

In fact, several priests vie at times among themselves, to know which of them could relate and inform each other of the greatest and most odious sins, communicated to them in the *sacred confidential tribunal*. They take secret pride in having it in their power to make such communications. A bishop informed me of the sins one of his penitents told him in confession, who was a respectable lady, and an acquaintance of mine. He even mentioned her name. Some coolness existed between a certain priest and myself, to whom I was in the habit of going to confession previous to our misunderstanding; in the course of some time after, he revealed my sacramental confession to others in my presence. I have been often an ocular witness to the abuses, licentiousness, and improper conduct of several clergymen in the confessional, who, in the place of healing and reconciling sinners to God, inflicted deep wounds both on their own souls, and those of their penitents. * * * Converting the tribunal of

forgiveness and reconciliation into that of binding and ensnaring—of grief and sorrow, into that of base pleasure and filthy lucre. It is, alas! become a mutual repository of vice and profanation:—a mutual depravity and corruption among many. It is a most delicate, precarious, and dangerous adventure for any person to open his mind and disclose the secrets of his heart—and entrust his soul and eternal welfare into the hands of many priests. *If the truth was known, at least the one half of them would be idle, until a thorough change and reformation would take place. Shall I be more explicit? Ah! I shudder at the idea,* and shall only say at present, that this sacrament, was considered before now as the pillar of the Roman Catholic church, through which grace was conveyed and salvation obtained; but now it is considered by many priests and prelates, as the pillar of the holy inquisition, the source of genuine information for sanguinary purposes; the security of absolute and universal influence, and the extermination of heretical depravity. In former days, the sacraments would not be conferred on those, who should be determined to murder, plunder and defame; but in our anarchical times, they would be conferred on none else by our sacerdotal inquisitors. It may not be amiss to lay down the position, and give the solution.

“A man goes to confession to a priest or bishop, and says, my Lord (or reverend father,) I have a case of conscience to pro-

pose and submit to your judgment for my direction: "Is it necessary for the validity of my confession and worthy receiving of the Blessed Eucharist, I should firmly believe, and unequivocally adhere to all the laws and constitutions of the Church of Rome, and commands of my spiritual superiors, conformably to said laws, &c. or any other laws or constitutions that might be established and enacted hereafter?" The confessor will most assuredly tell him that it is essentially necessary, even for obtaining salvation. The penitent will then reason a little with the father confessor, and say, "My conscience upbraids the principle, my understanding impresses the contrary, viz:—that it is not either lawful or religious to murder my fellow-creature for his creed, to banish my neighbour for his religious tenets, and embezzle his property; to assist inquisitors, commissioners, and notary apostolics in supplanting and exterminating all heretics, or those who differ from them in religious opinions; to discover and inhumanly punish all those who should oppose that horrid system, and prevent its direful operations;—that there is no power that can dispense with me in the execrable *acts of bloodshed, banishment and confiscation*, as already specified, or can *excommunicate me for non-compliance*. Therefore, I cannot believe, or tamely yield to these inhuman constitutions—stigmatizing my character, and tending to forfeit my right and title to all human happiness, and everlasting blessings." The father confessor

will exclaim :—" Sir, I tell you candidly, that unless you obey your spiritual superiors, popes, prelates, priests and bishops, councils, &c. in all things commanded (as being infallible in their laws and decisions) you will inevitably incur your eternal damnation—if you shall oppose their will and decrees, you will absolutely oppose the will of heaven, and positively incur the heavy censures and anathemas of the Roman Catholic Church, Neither will, or can I, absolve you from your sins, until you shall firmly promise to obey and abide by all the laws and constitutions proposed, defined and supported by your church. In dismissing you thus, I only discharge my duty, and evade censures; therefore, consider yourself as a discarded member of the holy Roman Catholic Church in your present state of insubordination to ecclesiastical powers, and spiritual superiors !!"

The present code of inquisitorial laws, hold a prominent feature among our ecclesiastical canons and decrees; and for that reason, those who shall presume to disobey or oppose them are liable to be treated and dismissed as above.

How many Roman Catholics, clergy and laity, will disavow and reprobate these inquisitorial principles, disobey their spiritual superiors, and suffer the privation of all sacred rites, divine institutions, and temporal properties, rather than co-operate in the perpetration of such infamous crimes and intolerant measures? I answer :—As many as will prefer religion to human interest, the voice

of heaven to contradictory and cruel edicts, the dictates of reason to hood-winked obedience; and reprobate the cruel system in public and private—abet and applaud every salutary measure adopted to destroy its existence, and prevent future recurrences—I say, those, and no more. How many priests will oppose their spiritual guides, and refuse to co-operate in the execution of horrible laws and treasonable practices, devised and enacted against the lives and properties of honest and upright men, true christians and fellow citizens; in a word, against the king and constitution?—I say, all those who shall unfeignedly preach loyalty in its full extent; who will inveigh against all illegal constitutions, treasonable oaths, and irreligious pursuits—who will inculcate the absolute necessity of obeying God before men—rejecting and despising all commands and injunctions enjoined by popes, bishops, and priests, contrary to the state, contrary to religion, reason and justice;—who shall confer sacraments and administer spiritual consolation to all, who will oppose and condemn the nefarious system and treacherous principles established by the promoters and ministers of the alarming and malignant inquisition, and shall withdraw them from all who should abet and encourage that detestable scheme—I say, all those, and no more. How many clergymen can be considered loyal and faithful? All those, who shall independently act as above, and no more. How many, on the contrary, can be justly and strictly considered disloyal

and unfaithful? All those who will not act according to the principles now laid down.—The former should be encouraged and made independent, and the latter watched and circumscribed by cohibitive restrictions. Draw a line of discrimination between the conformists and non-conformists, loyalists and non-loyalists, and you will necessarily conclude with St. Gregory, “Multi sacerdotes, pauci sacerdotes; multi nomine, pauci opere.” “Many priests, few priests; many in name, but few in reality.” And I may add, Multi inquisitores, pauci fideles:—many inquisitors, but few loyalists.

Here is a *preposterous tribunal*, erected in the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church, established in various realms and different islands of all Christendom; interwoven with innumerable disasters, replete with incalculable evils, and bereft of all human feelings and social order; engrafted on the strongest prejudices of the deluded populace, vested with an awful form, and adorned with a sacred object, tantamount to the reality of the religion it pretends to defend—entrusted with unlimited authority, and covered with enticing honours: it is considered as of divine origin by a large portion of the community, and one of the strongest pillars of their church. But let the friend of humanity and liberal sentiments, the man of expanded ideas and enlightened intellects cast his eyes on the crimsoned pages of this abominable tribunal, and behold its black code of criminous forms, and the fatal consequences produced by its

ascendant power over the minds and morals of deluded mortals, and he shall, without hesitation, conclude that this inquisitorial establishment was not of divine authority, or apostolic institution, but rather of an infernal invention, supported by monopolizing power and fraudulent influence.

The devil has endeavoured to imitate all the divine institutions established in heaven and practised on earth, for the glory of God and salvation of man. When the Almighty created the angels to adore himself in heaven; Lucifer, the arch-angel, in his elevated state among these celestial beings, through pride, put *himself* in *competition* with the *Most High*, suggested his thoughts to the rest of the angels—the third* part of them yielded to the temptation, and paid him divine homage (before they were confirmed in glory.) In consequence of this transgression, they were doomed to eternal woe. God afterwards created man in a state of innocence and uprightness, in order to know, love, and serve himself for a limited time on earth, and afterwards to fill the vacant seats from whence the *apostate angels* fell, and enjoy eternal bliss. The devil envied the first man in this happy state, and with his sophistical arguments bewildered his reason, and captivated his soul in original sin, which entailed on mankind innumerable evils.† To repair these calamities and deep wounds inflicted on the soul, and procure a remedy suitable to the disease, the Almighty God sent his

* According to St. Thomas of Aquin.

Son from heaven to suffer and establish a church on earth—to appoint a christian ministry—to institute sacraments, confer grace, and strengthen the weak, &c. The devil also, as a competitor, *established* HIS OWN CHURCH *on earth*, called “*the* HOLY INQUISITION,” and ordained priests and bishops to execute his diabolical constitutions, and in like manner instituted infernal sacraments with their constituent parts, viz. author, minister, subject, matter and form. The author is himself:—the minister is the clerical inquisitor, or penitentiary, who confers the sacraments:—the subject is the deluded man, who aids and assists the promoters and abettors of the system alluded to, or the man who becomes penitent for his loyalty and fidelity:—the form are the words of the horrid oaths, execrable edicts, and sacrilegious excommunications issued against those who should oppose the measure—and the indulgences and the remissions held forth to those who should defend the cause and promote the interest of all inquisitors. The common *enemy* of man has engaged the ministers of the Gospel to become the ministers of a polluted court, and empowered them to confer the sacraments of the new law on the members of that corrupt tribunal, and withdraw them from faithful Christians and loyal men. Thus are the sacraments, of divine institution, made subservient to diabolical persecutions. Let the subjects of this infernal institution take directions, and receive the sacraments from the sacrilegious hands of its

perjured Clergy ; but let the pious Christian and loyal subject take the advice of Father Avilla—" A man should look for a director among *a thousand* Clergymen." But I would rather take the advice of St. Francis de Sales " A man should look for a director, not only among a thousand, *but among ten thousand priests.*"

When the Bishop saw that I would not comply with the instructions furnished, with respect to my solitary retreat in the Academy, and auricular confession to his diocesan penitentiary, (a well-tutored inquisitor,) he wrote me the following letter :—

REV. SIR.—It must be clearly in your recollection, that when I was last favoured with a visit from you, on the 20th of the last month, I desired you would call on me again in the course of that day, to receive, in writing, the instructions which I felt it my duty to communicate. You have not thought proper to comply with this my just desire ; nor have you, since that period, though I daily expected it, applied in person, or otherwise, for these instructions.

" Therefore I beg to state now, what it was my intention to have stated on that day, viz. that I shall restore to you certain spiritual faculties and powers, that have been withdrawn from you, as soon as you shall have expressed (by a letter addressed to me, or in any other authentic and satisfactory manner,) your humble acknowledgment of, and deep contrition for the scandalous and grossly disrespectful conduct which you pub-

licly used towards me in the chapel of Oning, on Sunday the eighteenth day of June last, on the occasion of the episcopal visitation in that parish. I must, however add, that in no circumstance will I consent that you should exercise pastoral functions in the parishes of Oning or Templorum, until you shall have shewn to me the collation, if any there be, canonically made to you of these parishes ; or until you shall have otherwise proved your just title to hold and possess that benefice.

I am, Rev. Sir, your obedient
humble servant,
KYRAN MARUM,
R. C. Bishop of Ossory."

I have precisely related the instructions communicated to me on the 20th of the month preceding November, 1815, alluded to by the bishop, and made a correct statement in the foregoing pages, according to the lively and indelible impression they made on my mind.

From this statement, it is easily inferred, how far the requisitions insisted upon in his letter of the 20th of October, and the promises held forth in the subsequent letter of the 20th of the following month, (Nov. 1815) differ and vary in attestations. Both were replete with a jumble of hypothetical mitigations, and extra-canonical palliations. I do not charge the Doctor with telling an untruth in his letter, by stating what did not occur, and relating facts that did not exist, but do suppose that his memory failed, and his inte-

lects wavered; still the *inquisitorial faculties* remained quite unimpaired and inflexible. After he delivered his instructions to me relative to the extraordinary retreat, and penitentiary confession, as already stated, I signified that I would call on him before I would leave Kilkenny, in case I should make up my mind, and determine to undergo the course of penance prescribed, and mode of humiliation devised. I could not prevail on myself to comply with the intolerant conditions required; therefore, I considered it useless, and rather painful to return again to the Doctor, as I could not comply with the injunctions enjoined. In this letter he says, "I shall restore to you certain spiritual faculties," &c. "as soon as you shall have expressed by letter, addressed to me," &c. "your humble acknowledgment," &c.—The pious Bishop wants me to do what God never ordained, what the church of Christ never required, or could insist upon, and what was not in the power of man to declare, viz. to acknowledge a crime, in the face of the public, that was never committed; to excite and express contrition without a matter or cause. He requires I should acknowledge and declare what he himself was, and is, strictly bound to do, in consequence of the gross scandal he gave, and the unwarrantable attack he made on my character, in the chapel of Oning; and the subsequent privation of temporal property and spiritual rights. Perhaps the infallible Bishop wished I should submit to, and support the principle, "that *virtue* can be changed into *vice*, and *vice* into *virtue*,"

I ask any sound divine and intelligent man, is it a virtue to defend a public character, untried and unconvicted, from foul aspersions and insidious attacks?—to repel scandal, and thereby protect religion, when exposed by obscure intrigues and preconcerted designs? I ask, is it a criminal apathy to listen with silence to the laceration of the one, and suffer with impunity the injury done to the other? I am sure that no man, *except an inquisitor*, will deny the virtue of the former, and necessity of the latter: but the enlightened prelate endeavoured, by severe censures, to compel me to acknowledge publicly this laudable self-defence, to be a most enormous crime, and the real crime of supporting tyranny to be an *obligatory virtue of true obedience!!* *The ministers of the holy Inquisition exclusively claim the privilege and power of changing virtue into vice, and vice into virtue.* By a speedy compliance with such orders, and unequivocal acknowledgement of the power of changing virtue, &c. as above, my bishop promised he would restore me certain spiritual faculties and powers. ‘Certain faculties,’ such as the celebration of mass and praying over the dead; which would not empower or furnish me with the necessary means and favourable opportunity of opposing the inquisitorial system and impressing true loyalty, as auricular confessions and public preaching would. I understand from high authority and public report, that (in case of submitting to, and complying with episcopal authorities and papal constitutions) I would

be called to a certain city, where my faculties and liberties would be restrained exclusively to the celebration of mass in a certain *nunnery*, and the *attendance of offices* over the *dead*, in order to be under the immediate *inspection* and *arrogant controul* of a *supercilious bishop*, *inquisitorial chapter*, and *cloistered nuns !!!*—God help poor Mr. Morissy then between the *bishop* and his *nuns !!* The Doctor ends his letter by declaring that he will not consent I should exercise pastoral functions in my parish, unless I would produce a canonical collation of said benefice ; in compliance, I produced the letters of my former bishop, Doctor Lanigan, who gave me the parish : Doctor Marum made *extracts* from said *letters*, which were sufficient (besides time and usage) to prove my right and title to said parish, and therefore, he, for ever after, *suppressed* the *contents* of these *letters*.—In the body of the aforesaid letter, the prelate, Dr. M. holds out some feigned expectations of spiritual powers and limited faculties, by expressing my sorrow in some authentic manner, either publicly or privately, for speaking in vindication of my character, at the chapel of Oning the 18th of June, 1815.

In order to effect a reconciliation by some possible means, I appeared, in said chapel, before the congregation, on Sunday, the 21st January, 1816, and made the following declarations, which I considered quite sufficient and amply satisfactory in the eyes of God and man, even in case of guilt, viz.

“ My good people, it is my ardent wish, this day, to bring to your recollection the disagreeable circumstances which occurred here on the 18th June, 1815, between Doctor Marum and myself. I am come here, on this day of our Lord, to my altar and congregation, to make a public and solemn declaration in the presence of all assembled in this chapel, that I am sincerely sorry for what happened on that day, relative to the subject matter of disputation and misunderstanding now in existence between our prelate and myself, if I have committed sin in the sight of God—insulted my bishop, or scandalized the faithful. My entire intention, on that day, was to insult no man, but to defend my character and preserve my reputation in the face of the public.”—Immediately after, I acquainted Doctor Marum of this public acknowledgment, in compliance with any obligation I might have incurred on the occasion, who said that no declaration would satisfy him, “ but an unequivocal and downright acknowledgment of actual guilt and gross scandal.” Thus was I frustrated in my laudable efforts for accomplishing an effectual reconciliation. But both my spiritual and temporal misfortunes were encreasing and multiplying, in proportion to my longanimity in sufferings and forbearance in persecutions:—and in proportion as the will and intrigues of sworn enemies were opposed and not complied with.

Under the sanction and influence of inquisitorial despotism, was my house attacked, broke and robbed, as can be seen by the reward offered.

REWARD.

"Whereas, on the night of Saturday, the 9th of December last, some person or persons unknown, feloniously forced open my house in Artlone, at the chapel near Piltown, broke locks, and different parts of said house inside : and whereas the same banditti (as it is conjectured) re-entered the same house on the 2d inst. took off and carried away the lock of the street door ; and also, on the 15th of the same month, they attacked the same house the third time, broke and cut the doors into pieces, and besides, took away some of my property.

"I do hereby offer a reward of Twenty Guineas, to any person or persons, who will within six calendar months from the date hereof, give such information to Edward Elliot, of Clonmore, Esq. or to myself, as shall lead to the conviction of the perpetrators of the above outrages.

"We further pledge ourselves, (if required) as much as we possibly can, to conceal the names of those who shall give this useful and necessary information."

EDWARD ELLIOTT, J. P.
LAUR. MORISSY, P. P.

Tinakilly, June 20, 1816.

Mr. Elliott is a very active magistrate, and indefatigable in the discharge of his duty as a

justice of the peace : a gentleman of conciliatory demeanor in the circle of his jurisdiction, and of heroic fortitude in the time of public danger ; and who, to my own personal knowledge, for many years, contributed most successfully towards the preservation of the peace and tranquillity of the country he lives in.—Notwithstanding, no man gave the information required. The clerical influence and overwhelming system of religious despotism prevailed—I got this reward posted up in different places throughout my parish, and affixed it to a tree before my chapel door. The *intruding* clergyman, Mr. Cody, who was then officiating in my parish, *threatened from the altar to punish whoever posted up said reward*, said much in favour of the people, and against charging them with acting wrong, or of being guilty of any misdemeanor. *Another clerical intruder*, Mr. Henebry, said, from the altar of my parish chapel, before a crowded congregation, *“that they were as strictly bound to listen to and obey the superior of the diocess, and adhere to his instructions and injunctions, as to Jesus Christ, if he should come from heaven and preach to them in person.”* Although, at the same time, this same superior was, by practice, doctrine, and censures, transgressing the precepts of the same God, annulling divine institutions, and infringing on the laws of his country.

My curate, Mr. Mansfield, told my flock, “that they would incur censures and be severely punished by their bishop, if they

should apply to me on any parochial occasion, or receive any sacraments or spiritual consolation through my pastoral administration. He (M.) *actually horse-whipped* some of my parishioners, on the public road, for hearing my mass and listening to my prayers and exhortations. Were I minute enough in relating similar circumstances, I could fill volumes.

On the day (21st January) that I made the unmerited public acknowledgments, &c. as before mentioned, I said mass, and reassumed my pastoral functions, (after the expiration of an uncanonical suspension) to comply with the indispensable obligation I was under, of discharging them faithfully, until I should be prevented by physical power, or canonical crimes. The inquisitorial and antimonarchial clergy instantaneously exclaimed against me from every quarter—they endeavoured to incense the people, and provoke them to exasperation—some of them spoke publicly from the altars to my disadvantage.—My curate proclaimed aloud : (in a full congregation) “that there was no more virtue in my mass than in a layman’s mass.” Grand heresy, according to the doctrine of the Roman Church, viz. “that the validity or invalidity of the mass depends on the state the priest is in, but not on *Jesus Christ the High Priest*, or his merits.” This was an absolute cause of suspension ; still he escaped unpunished, because he was a zealous inquisitor, as did many more, in this lamentable case. For remark, that inquisitors are

the greatest heretics in the world, with respect to the divine law and Church of Christ on earth,—but are considered the best Christians, now in the Roman Catholic Church, whilst they support foreign power and domestic tyranny, &c.—The sacerdotal phalanx of this heterodoxy would not give sacraments to any Christian who should receive any spiritual aid from me; they would insist on their making a general confession since the time they began to confess to me, under this false and ignorant idea, that I lost the power of absolving and conferring sacraments, in consequence of disobedience to episcopal authority; let that authority act right or wrong, be just or unjust, &c. and let me be injured or not injured, though at the same time I was doing nothing, but obeying God and discharging pastoral duties. From the period of my suspension (not through necessity or obligation, but condescension) I obeyed the illicit and invalid censure imposed, whilst I entertained any hopes of reconciliation, and in the interim received sacraments, as a laic, among the faithful. I was deprived even of this consolation. Thus was I stripped of all I possessed in this world, both spiritual and temporal: yes! every means possible were adopted and tried to deprive me of God himself, by yielding to and adopting inquisitorial measures for inhuman purposes, &c. At length I applied for sacraments, to some learned and independent clergymen; I shewed them the documents of superiors, and the censures imposed; they coolly and de-

liberately examined them, and were of a decided opinion, "that I was an injured man; that the suspensions were invalid and not binding:" and therefore, they heard my confession, and gave me the blessed sacrament as often as I applied, and even permitted me to celebrate, &c. in their own parishes:—these priests were not inquisitors or abettors of the system, but real ministers of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and enlightened men.—As the members of the holy establishment alluded to, are authorized to say what they think, and do what they please, they industriously reported, "that I was avaricious and extorting money from my parishioners, which calumny said parishioners completely refuted in their testimonials. There are two things by which parochial dues are regulated, and can be justly demanded, viz. custom accompanied by certain conditions, and sanctioned by the superior of the diocese; and secondly, diocesan statutes, by which the sum to be demanded is determined. The first was not established in the diocese of Ossory, as Doctor Lanigan, a little before this time, prohibited his clergy to exact any retributions from their parishioners beyond the stipulated dues; and said, "if they did they would be strictly bound to restitution for the overplus." I called different times on my superiors for these statutes; some told me they could not find them among their papers; some more said they had lost them, and desired I should apply to some of the parish priests who had them in their posses-

sion. I enquired and could not procure them by any chance; therefore I had no other criterion to be guided by, but the general custom practised by those who read them and knew their contents; and for the safety of my conscience, I generally charged my people less than they did. The parish clergymen were and are strictly bound in conscience and justice, to inform their flocks of the nature and amount of the parochial dues regulated by said statutes, in order that their parishioners might know what to give, and also prevent the extortion of avaricious priests. Notwithstanding the people were kept in ignorance, for the base purpose of extorting more than the diocesan statutes allowed. In order to make a defence against the malicious attack now specified, and also to know how much I might expect and ask, I made further enquiries, and at length by verbal information, came to the knowledge of these regulations respecting the parochial dues: then I announced and explained said statutes to my flock, conformably to my bounden duty, and informed them that no more could be demanded, or received by any priest, except voluntarily offered. The clergy in general felt indignant at this exposure of their past injustice and extortion, and were enraged at this promulgation, which might justly prevent future impositions, and cause a reduction in extraordinary demands. To prove the fact, I shall quote an instance which happened at

the interment of one of my neighbouring parish priests, the Rev. Mr. Fitzpatrick, of Mouncoyne. I went, according to custom and usage, to pray for, and officiate at the funeral obsequies of this worthy man, who was a *rara avis* among the priests. I was peremptorily prevented from officiating by the clergymen there—I was pointed out as a rotten sheep among the holy inquisitors, and was insulted by one of them in particular, (a near relative of the deceased) for the promulgation of the diocesan statutes, from whom I received a letter the following day, which I shall now transcribe, just as I had received it :—

“ Dear Sir,—I sit down to write you from the best motive, probably you may say mind your own business, but I hope you will take it as coming from a good motive. Nothing could distress me more than to see you yesterday sitting at the altar, as you were: not one there but felt for you as a Brother Priest. from your last step indeed a person would imagine you were deprived of your reason, to go to a public chapel under a censure in open defiance to your Bishop, sure you know he cannot be the first who will submit, is it not your duty, even though you were unjustly censured. you should submit but appeal—and persevere To do so surely the submission the Bishop required was easily complied with I think in the beginning there might be some severity practised towards you, but I think

Dr. Marum inTend and wishd to have you restord, I think he has To good a Heart and Religion Too much at Heart to wish to persecute any one, I solemnly declare it my opinion : Repentance is never too late, and I am sure he has a HearT too much dilatd with goodness, to refuse you again into the bosom, of the church if you only shew publick signs of repentance and throw yourself at his mercy, short any of us will live in this world, we enjoy little and that but for a shorT time, we see graves open for young as well as old daily your own uneasiness of mind will say more to you than I am able your exortation of sunday week threw an odium upon all the priests of the Diocess and upon yourself surely, to tell a whole congregation you had been ignorant here to fore of the statues of the Diocess, more shame for you, but now finding them you would ask but so much, why not say restore; you know many in every Parish pays nothing, some being too poor more not wishing to do, then if some are not a little generous we cant, live; I am noT afraid as long as I live but I will have enough, all I feel for is your situation, take with you some Priest and as I said before throw yourself aT the mercy of your Bishop if you chose I will go with you or would any when I would be of any use be assured, I write this in a hurry and without any orde, but be assured from the best inTention the sooner you go the better, and youl find he

will soon do something for you wishing you the grace of God and a reconciliation to your church I remain your humble servanT

J FITZPATRICK

Laurel Hill February 1st 1816
To Revd Mr. Morrissy Pilltown

In a few days after, I sent the following answer to Mr. Fitzpatrick's letter:—

Tinakilly, Feb. 8, 1816.

Dear Sir,—I received your letter of the 1st inst. wherein I scarcely can find any thing, but a mass of inconsistency emanating from sinister motives, temporal emoluments, and, perhaps, just apprehensions of public censures and popular invectives * * * It teems apparently with sympathy, but it is eventually replete with groundless charges and pert reproaches—it pretends friendship, but betrays insincerity; it flatters vain expectations, but, in reality, gives no solid security.—Now, sir, I shall proceed to answer and refute the different charges, and vague remarks of your *polite* letter.

The first is:—“Nothing could distress me more than to see you yesterday situated as you were, &c.”

In retortion:—Nothing could astonish me more than the cool and vulgar treatment you manifested that day towards me; (a man who went to pray for a priest—to pay respect to the remains of an unfeigned friend, and to sympathise with you for the loss of a worthy

relative) you would not deign to speak to me previous to the office : you would not ask me to join you in the choir after an unwarrantable prohibition—you imperiously and impolitely attacked me in the sacristy, after the divine office was over, for celebrating mass in my own chapel, and explaining the nature of the statutes and stipulated dues of the diocess. Permit me to say, and to infer from your conduct on that day, that you felt more for the promulgation of these statutes, the obligation enjoined, and restriction incurred, (as was announced in the chapel of Oning) than for the *death* of your *cousin*, laid low in the chapel of Moin-Coyne.

The second :—"From your last step indeed, a person would imagine you were deprived of your reason, to go to a public chapel, under a censure, &c."

Sir, I must applaud your candour and sincerity, for, by intimating that I lost my reason, you thereby acknowledge that I did, previous to that period, possess that inestimable power of the soul, which should guide and govern all our actions. I am extremely sorry I cannot, with any degree of propriety, make a reciprocal declaration in favour of ——— a man cannot lose what he never had !!!

The third :—"You should submit, though you were unjustly censured ; the submission required by the bishop was easily complied with."

I can tell you, that these were not your sentiments on the subject before now. How comes this prevarication? How comes this sudden change of knowledge, reason, and decision? Ultimate cause—an apprehension of a reduction in the parochial dues.

The fourth :—"Repentance is never too late."

Sir, I am glad of it, for your own sake, as well as mine.

The fifth :—"The bishop will not refuse you again into the bosom of the church, if you shew signs of repentance."

You ought to know, that the censure imposed did not, nor could it exclude me from the bosom of the church; still you peremptorily pronounce that exclusion, without giving any satisfactory authenticity, or quoting any theological authority for your assertion—a gross misapprehension of the canons :—a strange misunderstanding of censures.

The sixth :—"Your exhortation of Sunday week threw an odium upon all the priests of the diocess, &c. for speaking of the parochial dues, &c."

How an odium? Is it because the bishops established laws for the *support* of the *clergy*, the *prevention* of *injustice*, and *hinderance* of *avarice*? Is it because the priests who got the statutes, or heard them read, did not give them publicity, and acquaint their flocks with the tenor and importance of them? Or, finally, is it because grievous charges and

public impositions (as is the case with —) are now discovered by the exhortation and promulgation alluded to?—Reflect for a moment, and recollect whether, if you were treated as I am, would it bring an odium upon the diocese; would it imprint an everlasting stigma on the reputation of those who should wound your moral character, and deprive you of the bread of life, without a sufficient cause, *à pari*.

Finally, you said:—"You would go with me to the bishop."

Sir,—This is not the first time you made similar promises and broke them. When I called on you for a character to *Doctor Troy*, you refused it; when I made a particular request to go with me to *Doctor Mansfield*, for the purpose of effecting a reconciliation, you (after promising) would not comply.

No candour—no dependance—

I am, Dear sir,

your humble servant,

LAURENCE MORISSY.

The Rev. Mr. Fitzpatrick, Slieve.

Oh! what an infatuation do the Irish labour under; how can we altogether reproach the laity for their ignorance and credulity in attributing *infallibility* to the bishops of Ireland, when we see an old experienced parish priest, under his hand and seal, affirming, "*that a man ought to obey his bishop whether he acts right or wrong.*"—Another clergyman announcing to the public from the altar of a parish chapel, in the county of

Kilkenny, "*that a spiritual superior should be listened to, and believed with the same credibility, as if Jesus Christ would make his appearance and preach the same doctrine.*"—

Alluding to a superior of the diocese of Ossory, who was, at the moment, notoriously violating the laws of God and man, by illegal taxations, irreligious censures, &c.—Several other priests industriously circulating and impressing on the minds of many, "*that two bishops and a few clergymen, assembled in the city of Kilkenny, were infallible in their opinion and sure in their decision,*" against a man, whom they condemned without a *hearing, judge or jury*. Many men, even of superior knowledge, among Roman Catholics, believed the delusive doctrine***

A great proof of the horrible system now in existence, and of the popular credence of the *infallibility of the Irish Hierarchy*, and of implicit obedience to any scheme devised and supported by this ecclesiastical authority.—

After being suspended by *Doctor Marum*, I made application for redress to the archbishop of the province, *Doctor Troy*, who, as usual, refused to interfere, and referred me back again to my bishop. Afterwards I made application, for the same purpose, to the Metropolitan of all Ireland, *Doctor O'Reilly* of Drogheda, who likewise referred me back to both *Doctor Troy* and *Doctor Marum*.—I ought to consider myself happy in carrying my cross as our Saviour did, for I had four judges to impose it on my shoulders as he

had, viz. Doctor Mansfield the vicar Capitular, "*Annas*;" Doctor Marum, bishop of Ossory, "*Pilate*;" Doctor Troy, archbishop of Dublin, "*Herod*;" and Doctor O'Reilly, Metropolitan of all Ireland, "*Caiaphas*." I expect their lordships will not be displeased with me for comparing them to the monarchs of the earth, whereas they have no objection to be compared to the *Most High*, by attributing *infallibility* to themselves, and to the *angels of heaven*, by being considered the *angels of men*, in announcing to the world the will of God in the extirpation of *heresy* by bloodshed, banishment, and confiscation—a *doctrine* not to be found, indeed, in HOLY WRIT, or practised by our Saviour; or inculcated by the apostles.—Notwithstanding my disappointments, I still persevered, and made the following appeal, from Doctor Marum's tribunal to Doctor Troy's:—

Revme. Domine,

"Vobis visum est epistola 20 Junii, 1815, memonere pœnam suspensionis ab ordine et officio illico incursum, nisi quædam delicta specificè in eadem epistola descripta, et quæ in ecclesia de Oning a me adversus vos patrata declarastis, die dominicâ sequenti in eadem ecclesia publicè coram Revdo. Carroll, et universo populo, alta et intelligibili voce, tam anglice quam hibernice humiliter agnoscerem.

"Vobis visum est pariter, die 20 Julii sequentis, enumerare in epistola eadem cri-

mina, addendo alia duo, "unum de mea absentia a colloquio quod locum interea obtinuerat;" alterum de mea absentia per plures dies parochiis meae curae commissis;" et ob eas causas me sententia suspensionis ab exercitio sacrorum ordinum ad tres menses ferire, et omni jurisdictione spirituali privare — nec non prohibere ne exigere aut recipere ullas voluntarias contributiones vulgo dictas stipendia parochialia a fidelibus per illud temporis spatium:—prohibere ulterius, ne resumerem (supradictis mensibus etiam elapsis) exercitium sacrorum ordinum, aut spirituum functionum, nisi permissione a vobis prius supplicata, et receptis cum decora docilitate praelectionibus et monitionibus quas ex officio impertiri dignemini.

"Vobis visum est tertio scribere die 15, 9bris, et decere, "quod mihi restitueretis quasdam facultates spirituales et potestates quae a me retractae fuerant, statimque per epistolam aut alio quocunque modo autentico et satisgrato, eadem de quibus supra, crimina in ecclesia de Oning commissa humilime agnoscerem." Adjunxistis sequentem declarationem. "Addamus necesse est, nos nunquam in quibuscunque rerum adjunctis, consensuros ut exercitias pastorales functiones in paræciis de Oning et Templeorum donec ostendas nobis collationem (si quae sit ejusmodi) canonicè datam harum paræciarum; aut donec probaveris tuum justum titulum ad tenendum et possidendum illud beneficium."

“Liceat, Revme. Domine, pace vestra, in memoriam revocare, quod die 18 Junii, 1815. in eadem de Oning ecclesia coram frequentissimo populo ex altari assueretis alta voce, “Vos accepisse innumeras in me accusationes in multis foliis;” cum summæ meæ famæ detrimento, quas eodem tempore et loco, meo jure alta voce denegavi.

“Notitiam dedisti in mea ecclesia fore, ut die statuto in oppido de Kilkenny, haberetur quædam de me inquisitio, et monuistis, “ut omnes suas quærelas profuerent;” humiliter precatus sum, ut mihi fuerit licentia adesse in foro, meipsum defendendi causa; hoc renuistis.

“Hinc Ego Laurentius Morissy parochus de Oning et Templeorum, in diecesi Ossoriensi, coram vobis Revmo. K. meo episcopo hodie 22 Junii, 1816, in mea causa appareo et appello a vobis et a vestro tribunali ad Revmum. J. T. Dubliniensem—ut judicet de meo titulo ad meum beneficium, de illa epistola comminatoria, de trimensali suspensione, de vestris prohibitionibus, de accusationibus tam scriptis quam viva voce—de mystica illa et invidiosa intimatione accusationum indecora—de judicio aut foro in me incanonice habito—de vestra in me agendi ratione, qua parochiis meis a multis mensibus privatus sum, et alter in eas suffectus cum flagranti famæ meæ et rei familiaris injuria—de omni denique vexatione crudeli et injusta quam a vobis passus sum.

Et, ut mihi jus dicere liceat, Apostolos peto
instante, instantius, instantissime.

LAURENTIUS MORISSY,
Parochus de Oning et Templorum in diocesi
Ossoriensi.

Datum apud Oning, 21 die Junii, 1816.

Revmo. Kyran. Epo. Ossoriensi.

TRANSLATION.

My Lord,

You have deemed it proper to admonish me, by letter bearing date the 20th of June, 1816, "that I would immediately incur the pain of suspension from *office* and *order*, unless I should, in an humble manner, and in a loud and intelligible voice, both in *English* and *Irish*, on the following Sunday, publicly in the same chapel, before the Rev. Mr. Carroll, and the entire congregation, acknowledge the crimes which are specifically described in the same letter, and which you have declared I had committed against you in the chapel of Oning.

You have also thought it proper to enumerate, in a letter written on the 20th of July following, the same crimes with the addition of two more; the one for "absenting myself from a conference which was (in the interim) held," and the other, "for absenting myself for some days, from the parishes committed to my charge;" and for these reasons, to suspend me from the exercise of holy orders, for the space of three months, and deprive me of all spiritual jurisdiction—and, in like

manner, to prohibit I should exact or receive from the faithful, during said space of three months, any voluntary contributions, commonly called parochial dues;—to prohibit me from resuming (after the expiration of the aforesaid three months) the exercise of holy orders, or spiritual functions, unless I should first implore permission, and receive, with becoming docility, the instructions and admonitions you would officially vouchsafe to furnish me with.

You have likewise deemed it expedient, to write to me the third time, on the 15th of November, 1815, and say, “that you would restore to me certain spiritual faculties and powers, which were withdrawn from me, as soon as I should, by letter or in any other authentic and satisfactory manner, most humbly acknowledge the above crimes, committed in the chapel of Oning.” You have subjoined the following declaration: “I must however add, that in no circumstance will I consent that you should exercise pastoral functions in the parishes of Oning and Templeorum, until you shall have shewn to me the collation (if any there be) canonically made to you of these parishes; or until you shall have proved your just title to hold and possess that benefice.”

Vouchsafe, *my Lord*, I should bring to your recollection, that on the 18th of June, 1815, you had asserted, in said chapel of Oning, before a crowded congregation, in a loud voice, “that you had received several

sheets in folio full of charges against me," to the great disadvantage of my character ; which charges, at the same time, and in the same place, I have, by right, in my own vindication, denied.

You have given notice in my chapel, that "there would be, on a certain day, (10th of July following) a court of enquiry held concerning me, in the town of Kilkenny;" and you had warned the people, to produce all the charges they had to make against me on that occasion.

Therefore, I, Laurence Morrissy, parish priest of Oning and Templeorum, in the diocess of Ossory, do appear before you Kyran Marum, my bishop, on the 22d day of June, 1816, and appeal, in my own cause, from your tribunal to the tribunal of the most Reverend J. T. Troy, of Dublin, that he might judge of my title to my benefice—of your comminatory letter—of the suspension of three months—of your prohibitions—of your accusations in words and writing—of your mysterious, invidious, and unbecoming menaces and pretended charges—of the inquisitorial court uncanonically held, and the judgment pronounced, contrary to the sacred canons—of your mode of proceeding against me, by which I am deprived of my parish for several months, and another priest foisted into my place, to the material injury of my character and loss of property—and, in a word, of all the cruel and unjust treatment I have received from you.

And, to claim my right, I demand the Apostoli* instantaneously.

LAURENCE MORISSY.


Parish priest of Oning and Templeorum, in the diocese of Ossory.

Given at Oning, 21st of June, 1816.

To Kyran Marum, bishop of Ossory.

On the 22nd day of June, 1816, I applied to the Rev. Mr. Murphy, coadjutor to Doctor Marum, for the purpose of retaining him as witness to the serving and delivery of the above appeal, who refused to attend on the occasion, through dread. On the same day, (22nd June, 1816) I read and delivered the aforesaid appeal to Doctor Marum my bishop, in the presence of Mr. Joseph Henderkin, who promised me the Apostoli on the Friday following, (the 28th of the current month) but did not give it until the 10th day of July after. Every step was taken and measure resorted to, in order to prevent all future proceedings and investigations, as my destruction was already accomplished, and their own system put in execution ; as will appear in our subsequent pages. It was not properly speaking, an Apostoli, but rather an abusive, defective, negative, and self-definitive document. It is as follows :—

* A term given to the document obtained by the appellant from his superior to a higher authority.

 The above appeal in English is nearly a literal translation of the foregoing Latin original, which accounts for the harshness of the style.

“Kyranus Marum, Dei et S. Sedis Apostolicæ gratia, Episcopus, &c.”

“Kyran Marum, by the grace of God, and the holy apostolic See, Roman Catholic bishop of Ossory; to the Rev. Mr. Morrissy, health. Although your appeal, given *us* on the 22nd of June last, seemed altogether frivolous and rash, and could be easily refuted by *us*; when, at the same time, it is our earnest wish, that *our* reason for acting against *our* clerical subjects, though refractory, should publicly appear; and, for *our* great reverence and veneration towards the most Rev. Doctor Troy, Roman Catholic archbishop and metropolitan of the province of Dublin, *we* refer to him the business in this case, as *we* do by these presents, as to the effect of devolution only, but not of suspension. *We* then, willingly grant the reverential Apostoli required by you. *We* judge it necessary to make one remark here, viz. that in receiving your appeal, which you delivered to *us* on the 22nd of June, as we have already said, and in which you have not hesitated to arrogate to yourself the name of parish priest of Oning and Templeorum, *we* do not intend, nor could *we* intend, by any means, to approve of, or sanction such rash assumption; whereas, it does not appear to *us*, that you have, or ever had a just title to the aforesaid benefice of Oning and Templeorum. To which *we* affix our hand.

Given at Kilkenny, this 10th day of July, 1816.

KYRAN, Roman Catholic bishop of Ossory.
To the Rev. Laurence Morissy.

In the first place, the doctor should let his advocate prove, and the judge appointed decide, by a fair investigation and impartial trial, whether my appeal was frivolous, rash, &c. or not. In the beginning of his Apostoli, he assumes the office of the one, and arrogates the power of the other, by anticipating the decision according to his own private wishes. He must, by cavilling and bickering give to understand that he felt the weight of a just appeal, and dreaded the serious consequences of a canonical investigation and judicial decision.

2. Like a man in a state of aberration of mind, he consents to an appeal from his own tribunal to that of a superior power, and for that purpose grants the Apostoli:—and in the interim endeavours to annul the effects of both, when he says, “quoad effectum devolutivum duntaxat, non vero suspensivum.” For, an appeal suspends the operations of tyranny and injustice; and prevents the effects of suspensions, &c. “*lite pendente*,” “during the litigation,” All these happy effects Doctor Marum endeavours to counteract by his own private authority!! I had made different appeals from the commencement in this business, which alone were fully sufficient to render the censures and suspensions of my superiors null and void. But here bishop Marum mutilates and destroys the nature of both an appeal and Apostoli, by denying the advocates the privilege of investigation and inculcation in their legal

and canonical capacity—by allowing the judge *ad quem* no more power than merely the bare reception of an appeal; but not the power of judging, deciding, and insisting upon justice, according to the tenets of an appeal and nature of an Apostoli, which require, that advocates should be at liberty to argue in favour of their clients, and the judge appointed to interpose his authority and distribute justice according to the principles and rules laid down by the canon law. Therefore this Apostoli, by prescribing and limiting, &c. was defective, besides being insolent. The doctor ends by saying, that he shall not allow me the title of a parish priest, or suffer its confirmation; and thus my bishop puts the negative to all the powers of the metropolitan judge in this case, and limits his jurisdiction in his official capacity. In fact, he becomes the judge himself, and decides all in his own favour and justification. Why then did not this monopoly of superior jurisdiction give offence to the archbishop? Because they both conspired against, and mutually machinated the destruction of the loyal priest; as will further appear from subsequent documents:—After receiving the Apostoli from Doctor Marum, I waited on Doctor Troy, to learn from his lordship the time and place for holding an investigation of the charges preferred in my appeal against Dr. Marum. I had with me Mr. J. Risdale of Dublin, to witness the conversation that would take place on that occasion, who wrote

the substance of our conference, and handed me a copy of it, which I shall now transcribe.

“ Doctor Troy directed in my presence, that Doctor Marum and Mr. Morrissy should attend him in Kilkenny, on a day, in the month of September next, to be fixed by Doctor Marum and Mr. Morrissy; and to give himself previous notice of it, and that he would attend, &c.”

WM. J. RIDSDALE.

2d August, 1816.

I called on my bishop the 6th day of the same month, for the purpose of appointing a certain day, according to Doctor Troy's desire—he gave me the following note :

“ Rev. Sir,—I fancy the 25th of September would suit Doctor Troy's convenience and your's; if so, I shall appoint that day for the purpose specified in your appeal.

KYRAN MARUM.

Kilkenny, Aug. 6, 1816.

Now, the day being mutually appointed for holding this trial, I had to procure an advocate and a procurator, according to the discipline of the canon law. I made application first, to some of the Roman Catholic clergymen of the diocese of Ossory, Wexford, Loughlan, Dublin, and Cashel; not one of them had either charity or independence enough to espouse the cause of a brother priest, for fear of incurring the displeasure of their bishops; knowing, as I must suppose and believe, that they would be degraded

and deposed for espousing my cause. Such is the law, such is the practice of bishops, notwithstanding their pretensions to the contrary.—2dly. I applied to some Roman Catholic lawyers, who refused to take my case in hands, as *bishops* were concerned. Certainly if they would, they could be excommunicated, (*at least when the Catholic emancipation would be granted*) and the people prevented, by similar censures, from retaining them as their counsel, or commune with them for aiding and assisting a man tainted with damnable heresy; or if not excommunicated, they could be deprived of the sacraments, (*if any they receive*) and their clients treated after the same manner. Alas! no justice from the prelate in his spiritual power, and ecclesiastical government—no canonical aid or fraternal sympathy from the brother priest—no civil protection or legal interference from the Catholic lawyer—no safety, no exemption from danger among the deluded rabble. The veracity of these assertions are sufficiently proved by the systematical refusal of the vast number of Roman Catholics, of almost every description, whom I consulted and entreated to interfere in my behalf, as an injured man, and that I should liberally reward them for their trouble, &c. especially the professional gentlemen. Let a man's case be right or wrong, could it be possibly supposed he could not find one individual among the clergy or laity (especially among those, whose profession sanctions

them to undertake the office) that would espouse his cause, if the case was not as I have described it? When bishops have such an extraordinary influence, by their domineering laws, over all descriptions of the Roman Catholic body, and when Roman Catholics themselves are so subservient to the enemies of liberty and enlightened government, under the disabilities they complain of; what then could be expected if they had more power and equal liberties?

Let government grant the Catholic claims, and they will unsheath the inquisitorial sword, and unveil the rack and the torture. Let the government give them unqualified emancipation, and they will sap the very foundation of the British constitution. Let our government admit Roman Catholic bishops into the imperial house of parliament, and they will establish the holy inquisition in the British empire.

Finally, I laid my case before an eminent Protestant barrister, *Counsellor Pennefeather*, and a Protestant procurator, Mr. John Wogan, who, with that principle of charity and liberality, and spirit of independence, (which I could not find among the members of my own church,) promised to step forward to vindicate the character, and secure the property of a man censured and dispossessed, without being tried or found guilty. This is not a matter of a spiritual or ecclesiastical nature, as my bishop pretends, but a matter of fact and real possession. I had now to

inform Doctor Troy in person, as I could not be certain of receiving an answer to a note, whereas he disappointed me before on similar occasions, that I was prepared to go into the investigation the day appointed. His lordship asked me, in the presence of his coadjutor bishop, Doctor Murray, "what advocate and procurator did I retain." I replied, and said, *Counsellor Pennefeather and Mr. Wogan*; he immediately objected and said he would not have them, &c.—he advised me to desist from any further proceedings, and requested I would go to confession to a certain priest in Dublin, whom he appointed in Doctor Murray's presence, for the same purpose (I must consider) as Doctor Marum did the penitentiary in Ossory; for the law is, "that there should be such a *forum* established in every diocess for similar purposes." Then I clearly saw, how desirous my bishop and archbishop were to ensnare me in these inquisitorial penitentiaries.—Why not direct me to go to confession to my ordinary confessor at home?—he was no inquisitor, he would not reveal my confession, he was not one of those dispensed with for that purpose.—See the directions of the court of Seville to confessors, with respect to the revealing of sacramental confessions, p. 18, p. 28. see the penitentiary of Ossory,* of Dublin—see the examples given before in regard of priests disclosing auricular confessions,* &c.—29, 30. The metropolitan and the suffragan were apprehensive of serious consequences, by

allowing an impartial investigation before an able advocate, who would, perhaps, during this trial, discover hidden schemes and treasonable plots. I refused complying with Doctor Troy's request in making my confession to his penitentiary, and told him I would insist on the right of reinstatement in my parish; he said, before Doctor Murray, that I would never be reinstated in my parish. Now, it is most notorious, ~~that~~ from the declarations of Bishop Marum in his Apostoli, and this affirmation of Doctor Troy, that both conspired against me, and formed efficacious resolutions to prevent this reinstatement, according to the laws and tenets of the court of *propaganda de inquisitione*; and the oaths given to support the measures of said court.

Thus was my case prematurely decided; thus was my exclusion determined by the judge (Doctor Troy) before he heard the trial—thus was order and justice subverted, by those who ought to establish order and distribute justice. I had then to return home quite fatigued, and unexpectedly disappointed; and, to confirm this system of refusal, Doctor Troy requested, “that Doctor Marum should acquaint me, that he would not receive my advocate.”—My bishop wrote the following note:—

“Rev. Sir,—Doctor Troy has requested I should inform you, that he will entertain and decide on your late appeal to him, in Kilkenny, on the 2d of next month, at 12

o'clock, and that he will not permit the case of either party to be advocated by a layman."

I remain your obedient humble servant,
KYRAN MARUM.

The Rev. L. Morrissy, Oning, Carrickonsuir.

Doctor Troy knew perfectly well, that Doctor Marum had no necessity of retaining a layman to advocate his cause, as he could command any clergyman in his diocese under pain of suspension to attend on the occasion. To refuse the advocacy of either party by a layman was a plausible *pretext*, in order to exclude my advocate, for certain reasons: to employ a layman, on this and similar occasions, is not prohibited by the law of the church: there is nothing more common in *Rome* than to retain lay advocates on all ecclesiastical transactions; it was a lay gentleman I retained as an advocate, in my cause there. Even Doctor Troy's and Doctor Marum's advocate in that city is a layman, a married man, *a clerk in propaganda de fide*; whom I often saw there, and was speaking to. As the ecclesiastical law allows this lay advocacy in *Rome*, why not in *Ireland*? If prohibited in *Ireland*, why not in *Rome*, and in other places, where the church and religion are the same? The reason is too obvious to require any elucidation; Roman Catholics are not excluded any where, *but Protestants are every where. A Protestant* layman may be *as prudent, as learned, and as conscientious* as a priest: why then exclude him? Religious prejudice, irrecon-

cibleable hatred, and sinister views are the ultimate cause. Notwithstanding my disappointments, I still solicited the advantage of a fair trial. My procurator wrote my bishop the following note :—

Carrick-on-suir, Sept. 21, 1816.

Sir,—“I have been directed by *Edward Pennefeather, Esq.* who is retained as advocate for the Rev. Laurence Morriissy, to apply to you for a copy of the charges preferred against him, on the alledged charges for which you thought proper to suspend him from clerical functions, and to deprive him of his ecclesiastical preferment. And, as it is presumed, these charges will make at least part of the subject matter of enquiry now pending, and to take place before the Most Reverend Doctor Troy, I request that you will take the trouble to furnish me with the above without delay.

I am, Sir,

your most obedient humble servant,

JOHN WOGAN,

Attorney for the Rev. L. Morissy.

To the Rt. Rev. Doctor Marum, Kilkenny.

In answer to the above letter, Doctor Marum sends the following :—

Kilkenny, Sept. 24, 1816.

Sir,—“In answer to your favour of the 21st which has just now reached me, I beg to state, that, in the letter which communicated to the Rev. Mr. Morriissy my determination of withdrawing from him certain spiritual faculties or powers, the causes on

which I grounded that measure are sufficiently specified. It is therefore in Mr. Morrissy's power, to give full information on this point, to the person whom he may select as his advocate—in my view of the subject, the Rev. Mr. Morrissy has not been deprived of an ecclesiastical preferment: the administration of the spiritual concerns of a certain portion of Roman Catholics; an administration, in its nature, precarious and temporary, has been taken out of his hands. This his spiritual superior was competent to do, *without assigning any cause.*"

I have the honour to be

Your obedient and humble servant,

K. MARUM, R. C. Bishop.

To John Wogan, Esq.

Doctor Marum is already in full possession of my retaining Counsellor Pennefeather as my advocate, still he asserts in the above note that I am to select another. Now both *Doctors join and coincide*:—the prelate says in the latter part of his letter, "In my view of the subject, the Rev. Mr. Morrissy has not been deprived of an ecclesiastical preferment, &c." The Doctor here is both right and wrong: he is right, according to the present mysterious system now established between the court of Rome, and the Irish Roman Catholic bishops, viz. "that there are no parish priests in Ireland,"—that "they are mere missionaries, as the clergy of England and America are,—moveable at the will and pleasure of their spiritual superiors, &c."—

He is wrong in denying both title and possession, where the council of Trent is not received.—Pope Calistus III. Con. Bassili. An. 1431. Riccius part 3. dec. 288. per tot. Dartis oper. Canon, tract. de Benefic. Sect. 6. Cap. 9, &c. besides many more, assert, “that a triennial peaceable possession is sufficient to constitute a right and title to a benefice;” and, “that a clergyman cannot be disturbed or dispossessed afterwards, for several cogent reasons; principally to put an end to litigations and injustice, and prevent perpetual scandals,” &c. To step over this canonical law, my bishop pretended I had no coloured title that would sanction the above triennial possession and corroborate that canon; he desired I should produce said title, if I had any. I laid before him several letters written to me by my former bishop, Doctor Lanigan, announcing my pastoral authority, with respect to the internal and external government of my parish, and unequivocally declaring me to be the pastor of the flock and proprietor of the benefice. He (D. M.) made extracts from these letters, and never after produced their contents here or in Rome, as a plea against my proper title; because he was fully convinced, that they would ultimately condemn his arbitrary proceedings.

2dly. I adduced not only triennial, but fourteen years possession. These, besides many other circumstances, constituted a *coloured title*, real possession and ecclesiastical

right, without any tergiversation whatsoever. But admitting that I was not canonically inducted, that I got no canonical collation, or had no coloured title of any kind, the learned bishop should know, that thirteen years possession were sufficient to supply all other deficiencies, in a diocese where the Council of Trent is not received. Ten years possession produces a coloured title, and three years afterwards a canonical prescription. Therefore, thirteen years possession is as good as a canonical induction and canonical collation; and puts an end to all controversies and litigations, on this or any similar subject for evermore :—"Riganti in Reg. 36. Canc. Apost. Pastor de Benefic. num. 7. Cardinalis de Luca de Benefic. discurs. 91. num. 16. Lotter. de re Benefic. libr. 2. quest. 53. num. 31. Rot. decis. 1004. Num. 4, &c."

3dly. It is an absolute fact that there are no parish priests where the Council of Trent is received, and no *concursum* held. This council made a decree that parishes should be conferred in the following manner, viz. "Let six examiners, men of learning, piety, and morality, be appointed in the diocesan synod, and sworn upon the Holy Evangelists, to act in their office with justice and conscientiousness in the appointment of good pastors, to preside over the flock in vacant parishes."—When a parish becomes vacant by the death, resignation, &c. of the pastor, the bishop is to call a *concursum*, viz. to "give notice to the coadjutors and candi-

dates of his diocess to come to the place appointed for examination. The clergymen selected for this purpose by the synod, and who compose the consistory, are, by virtue of their oaths, to examine the candidates with respect to their age, prudence, learning, piety, &c. afterwards, they are to point out to the bishop the most worthy among them to fill the awful situation of a parish priest, who should give him a collation, in form, of the vacant parish. On the succeeding Sunday, the appointed clergyman would go to the parish chapel attended by two more, one of whom would announce to the congregation their new parish priest, and read his canonical collation to them all; and would then, in their presence, give him ecclesiastical possession of his benefice: The other gentleman should take down all these transactions in writing, and insert them in the diocesan register, in order to prevent all future claims and litigations among priests and prelates, curates and pastors, &c. By this mode of collating, bishops are prevented from appointing bad subjects, near relatives, and ungodly men, through human respect, and sinister motives, before men of religion, sound integrity, and loyal principles. By this mode of discipline, the flock of Christ would be prevented from being misled by ignorant pastors and indolent shepherds," &c. *I wish the council acted with as much wisdom and justice in all other decrees, &c. and would, instead of approving of and encouraging the*

diabolical inquisition, give it a deadly blow, by issuing censures, and pronouncing excommunications against all who should support that detestable system, which brought disgrace on religion, and was the cause of the destruction of thousands.

Wherever this council is received no man can be elected, collated and inducted as parish priest any other way, except by virtue of this concursus, according to the mode and form laid down by the council of Trent, and Pope Pius the 5th who sanctioned the decree of the council, and annulled all other collations and appointments to benefices made contrary thereto, and which would have the care of souls annexed to them. Benedict XIV. and many others sanctioned the same decrees. Con. Trid. Ses. XXIV. Cap. XVIII. *Expedi maxime animarum saluti*. Papa Pius V. Cons. *in conferendis*. "Collatio parochialis facta sine examine per *concursum* est nulla et irrita, et præfata collatio parochialis eo modo collata vacat, ejusq; collatio ad sedem apostolicam spectat. Ita Zerol c. p. 1. Verb. Parochia, SS. 3. dub. 2. novissime Aloys. Ricc. in praxi rerum fori Eccl. Barbsa de Poroch. p. 1. cap. 2, &c. Et in foro conscientie non potest acceptari, aut retineri, sicut nec retineri valet beneficium provisum non servata forma requisita a jure, ut bene resolvunt Petr. Navar. de restitut. lib. 3. cap. 2. n. 350. Salon. 2. 2. quest. 5. de dominio. art. 4. cano. quest. 62. de dominio, pag. 160. Gabr. Vasq. 1. 2. quest. 163. Aloys. Rice. &c. A

parochial collation made without an examination by a concursus, is null and void ; and therefore, said parochial collation thus conferred, is vacant and null ; and devolves to the *Holy See*. Thus, Zerol. Aloys, &c. affirm as above. Neither can a parochial collation be received, or a benefice kept in conscience, which is not obtained and conferred according to the decree of, and form prescribed by, the council of Trent, and the constitution of Pope Pius the V.—both sanctioned by his successors ; as Peter Navar, in his treatise on restitution, Salon in his treatise on dominion, Cano on the same, and many more, relate and prove to be just and binding. Let those who doubt this doctrine, read the canon of the council and constitution of the Pope, &c. and inform themselves of the veracity of said ecclesiastical law.

The above canon law was never yet repealed or abrogated by any council, constitution, or apostolic mandate ; therefore, all the parishes in the province of Munster, Connaught, (the wardenship of Galway being excepted) and Ulster, conferred contrary to the aforesaid canon law and mode of collating are vacant at present, and will remain so until conferred by the *Holy See* ; as the council of Trent was received in said provinces, and no concursus held.—All these parishes are (if I may use the expression) in their widowhood, without a canonical pastor, without a parish priest, and without a real shepherd ; which cannot be productive of

that blessing, or attended with that grace, which God promises and gives to canonical appointments and religious inductions. These vacant parishes are governed by economists, (so called in Rome) who have no right or title to hold and retain them, by any law, canon, or in conscience, as already described and ascertained by the first authorities, in the church. Besides, I was lately informed by an Irish bishop, that the clergy of Ireland (fictitiously called parish priests) have no right to the ecclesiastical livings, and could be dispossessed *ad libitum episcoporum*, at the will of their bishops. I got the same information in Rome, from some of the members of the court which governs the R. C. church in Ireland, with the help of their inquisitors. No man can or will bring the certainty of the fact in question, but those who are ignorant of the ecclesiastical law, or those who wish to support the monopoly of superiors and pervert the law. Moreover, I was credibly informed in Rome, also, that the Holy See now considers all the priests of Ireland, (even in Leinster, where the Council of Trent was not received) as missionaries, on the same principle that they are considered in England and America, and are removeable *ad libitum superiorum*, at the discretion of their superiors.

Notwithstanding, the pastors of Leinster and of the wardenship of Galway, could claim a right to their benefices, and support their dignity if they were faithful

and unanimous; and had the coloured title and possession prescribed by the canon law. But the rest of the clergy throughout Ireland, styling themselves parish priests, without *title or honour*, have no right to that prerogative, either by law or in conscience, without a *concursus*, which, I understand, is not now held in any part of the kingdom. They will, I am certain, say, "that cannot be the case, as the Irish hierarchy is still preserved, and the clergy in actual possession of their ecclesiastical livings." I beg leave to remark, that they cannot boast of the one, or pretend to the other, whereas they have neither the one or the other by the laws of the land, or the laws of their own church. They have formerly lost their glebes and ecclesiastical possessions, as several would say, through the depravity of the clergy, and tyranny of superiors, by the just judgment and permission of Divine Providence. But, by a reversion of fortune, and the liberality of our humane government, a provision was offered and would be made, of which hostile invaders and clerical spoliators could not deprive them, without a just cause and impartial hearing.

Their honour and character would be secured against ecclesiastical calumniators and episcopal oppressors. These inestimable benefits would not be received by the clergy, unless they could get all and give nothing; unless government would endanger all, and secure nothing.—If the Catholic soldier spills his

blood in the field, in fighting the battles of his country, he is paid by his government;—but if an opportunity would offer, he is taught by the superiors of his church to spill the same blood in the extermination of the same government, for religion sake.—See the papal constitutions, &c.

If a Roman Catholic takes an oath of allegiance to support his king and constitution, he is dispensed with, and the obligation of the oath is removed, by imposing a more binding obligation, of a religious nature, to dethrone the same monarch, and overturn his heretical constitution. If the Roman Catholic is inclined from principle and superior knowledge to obey the laws and observe them inviolate, he is threatened by censures, and bound down by excommunications to disavow these principles and pay implicit obedience to the Roman Catholic canons, *which are (as he is told) above all other human laws, &c.*

Where then is sincerity to be found or looked for? Not in martial achievements, sacred oaths, or pretended loyalty, but in the arm of the law—in the establishment of a *Veto*, and in securing the interests and influence of the clergy by making a provision for their subsistence, and rendering them independent of foreign power and domestic tyranny; it is then the priests could boast of both property and independence to support their hierarchy against monopoly.—What—ever right or title they have, or possession

they hold, it is not from, or conformable to the present laws of their own church, but quite contrary and in direct opposition to them, as can be seen by the decrees and constitutions already described.

Does the hierarchy or sacred government of Ireland support and maintain the rights and privileges peculiar to it? By no means!! If it did, the second order would insist on having ecclesiastical councils held, provincial and diocesan synods established—composed of clerical orders and lay authorities, as matters at issue might require the measure: dean and chapter revoked in each diocese, for the election of bishops to vacant sees—concursus held for the promotion of pastors to vacant parishes; and coadjutors promoted according to merit and seniority; with many other privileges annexed to the clerical body. When a hierarchy is stripped of all her spiritual rights and temporal possessions, without making any resistance; when the clergy knowingly and willingly submit to their own degradation, without appealing or seeking redress; I ask on what basis does that hierarchy stand? she tamely yields up her rights and prerogatives, and therefore remains in a state of total defunction. A hierarchy is a sacred or ecclesiastical government—is the Catholic church of Ireland holily or ecclesiastically governed of late years? by no means, but on the contrary, *despotically and tyrannically*:—therefore, it remains as above * * * *Without a change no reformation, without*

reformation no justice, without justice no religion, and without religion no happiness, no security in church or state.

Doctor Marum admits the trial, announces the day, by the direction of the judge; but still would not furnish a copy of the charges according to the request of my advocate and procurator. This does not look like candid dealing, common justice, or legal proceedings.—On the same day he refused to comply with this request, he writes me the following note :

Kilkenny, Sept 24, 1816.

Rev. Sir,—“ In a letter which I have this day received from Doctor Troy, *his grace* directs, I would notify to you again, that he will hear your complaints, &c. here, on Wednesday the 2d of October, at noon, and that he will admit no lay advocate whomsoever—he further observes, that, if you can procure no clerical advocate, you may plead your cause in person.

I am, your obedient humble servant,
K. MARUM.

To the Rev. L. Morrissy, Carrick-on-suir.

Now it is obvious, that their lordships dreaded nothing more, than to bring this business before a lay advocate, who was not shackled by *inquisitorial intrigues*—before an *independent barrister* of extensive knowledge and deep penetration, who would fathom the scheme, and strike at the root—before a discerning lawyer, who would insist on justice, and expose treachery. At last they thought

to saddle myself, in person, with my own advocacy—a solitary individual without any knowledge of the charges preferred against him, (*if any there were*) without a witness, without a friend, among declared opponents and *sworn enemies*. How could I plead a cause, and expect justice from those who anticipated my destruction and perpetual expulsion?

My procurator writes his last letter on the subject to my bishop.

Carrick-on-suir, Sept. 28, 1816.

My Lord,—“ Mr. Morrissy handed me your letter of the 24th inst. (which he only received this morning) notifying Doctor Troy’s intention of hearing his complaints, &c. on the 2d of October, and that he would not allow him the benefit of a lay advocate; *why*, Mr. Morrissy should be debared such an advocate, *I cannot conceive*. He does not consider it prudent to plead his own cause, and finds it impossible, *from the dread* of incurring the displeasure of their own bishop, to procure a clerical one—he trusts, under these circumstances, Doctor Troy will not deny him a privilege to which, by the laws of his church *and his country* he is entitled; when this is acceded to, and that you will furnish him or me with a copy of the charges you alledged publicly in the chapel of Oning you had against him, and which, by your last letter, you gave to understand, will be

investigated before Doctor Troy, he will be ready to go into the investigation.

I am, my Lord,
your most obedient humble servant,
JOHN WOGAN.

To the Right Rev. Doctor Marum.

We received no answer to this letter, though we anxiously wished for and daily expected it, until (to our great surprise) we were informed that a mock trial was held, unknown to us, on the day appointed. In this letter, I declined the advocacy of my own cause, for the reasons before specified. In said letter, two essential conditions (permission of advocates, and copy of charges) were officially required, but not granted. We, of course, naturally concluded that the trial would not, or could not take place, until the conditions required would be complied with, and both parties present, &c. Notwithstanding, the trial was held, by the opposite party, and I was condemned for non-attendance; my case was dismissed, and my bishop acquitted, by the *judge, Doctor Troy*, from all charges and future proceedings, as will appear by the following dismissal.

Reverende Domine,—

Cum ad nos appellaveris ;

Rev. Sir,—When you appealed to *us*, in the case pending between you, Laurence Morrissey, Roman Catholic priest of Ossory, and Kyrán Marum, Roman Catholic bishop of Ossory, who gave you the reverential Apostoli, *we*, for your convenience, an-

nounced and notified to you, and all concerned, that you and they should come to the city of Kilkenny, the 2d of the present month, October, at 12 o'clock, for the purpose of deciding on your late appeal. *We* went, to our great inconvenience, (first serving citations) to the city of Kilkenny, and on the day and hour appointed, called on you three times, before many of the Roman Catholic priests of the diocese of Ossory, and many of the laity of the parish of Oning or Templeorum of said diocese, to support your appeal; but neither you or your procurator appeared to make an answer, *We vehemently* exclaimed in the presence of all, against your shameless conduct towards *us*, and at the same time publicly declared, as *we* do now by these presents, that you, for deserting your appeal, have lost your cause, and therefore *we* dismiss your troublesome action or appeal, and *we* free and disengage the aforesaid Doctor Marum, Roman Catholic bishop of Ossory, from the said appeal. To which *we* affix *our* hand, at *our* residence in Dublin, this 12th day of October, 1816.

It may not be foreign from the subject to make the following animadversions on this lamentable dismissal.

1. "We gave you, and all concerned notice to attend at Kilkenny, &c." Yes, they gave notice to one party, and *prevented* the other party from appearing and attending, *by the refusal of advocates*—furnishing charges, &c.

2d. "*We* went to the city of Kilkenny, we called you three times, but you or your procurator did not appear, &c." Yes, they served their inquisitors and agents with citations, though they themselves were willing enough to attend in the common cause to support the common system, and would not cite any of their subjects, (though being bound to do so) to advocate my cause, when dread of punishment and severe censures prevented them. Now they made a charge, "that neither I or my procurator had made our appearance to answer;" though they themselves prevented our appearance *by schemes, intrigues*, and frequent refusals; as it appears in our correspondence; in which we explicitly told them, that we would not attend unless they would accede to the conditions required, &c.

3dly. "You have deserted your appeal, and, for that reason, lost your cause, therefore we dismiss it, and disengage your bishop," &c. The letters of my attorney, incessantly calling for a trial, sufficiently refute *the pretended* desertion of my cause. The answer made to some and no reply to others, evidently demonstrate the *schemes* and *intrigues* resorted to, in holding *a mock trial* in our absence, *as a mask to screen perfidy, in order to dismiss a just cause crying to heaven for vengeance*. After this *deceitful trial* was over, a report was industriously and widely put in circulation, "that I had deserted my cause by absenting myself from my trial; that consequently I was condemned and superseded;

that *two bishops* together with some of their clergy *could not err* in their decision, or act wrong in their proceedings." Every man, according to every well established law, should be considered just and innocent until he would be impartially tried and legally convicted—I was never legally tried or canonically convicted, nevertheless, the sentence of condemnation was pronounced by the judge, who has to apprehend a more severe *judgment* another day ;—Siquis dixit justum injustum esse, abominabilis apud Deum est. Whoever pronounces the just unjust, is abominable in the sight of God. 'Ligandi, solvendique potestate se privat, qui tunc injuste exercet.' "The man, who unjustly exercises the power of loosening and binding, forfeits the same." In such a predicament stands the judge, who condemned the just, untried and unheard.

When all endeavours to procure justice and reconciliation proved ineffectual, I formed a strong resolution to seek abroad, what I could not find at home, "common justice." Hence, I made an appeal from *Doctor Troy's tribunal to the HOLY SEE.*

Illme et Revme. Domine,

(incipins) Postquam appellationem meam a sententia, &c.

Most Illustrious and Rev. Lord,

After you had vouchsafed to receive my appeal, from the sentence and various grievances, by which my bishop, Kyran of Ossory, *has persecuted me* ; I endeavoured,

with all my might, to procure a clergyman to advocate my cause, but in vain—not one of them would undertake my defence *through dread*. When it was rather unpleasant for me to advocate my own cause, I often prayed that a lay gentleman might be permitted to undertake the office: this you have totally objected to at different times, particularly in my bishop's letter, delivered to me on the 28th of September last, by your orders. On the same day my procurator, a respectable attorney, wrote to my bishop, requesting permission to retain a lay advocate, whereas no priest could be found willing to undertake the task; especially as the ecclesiastical law did not prohibit lay interference in such a case. I promised most cheerfully to be prepared for the trial, as soon as a copy of the charges, and permission for admitting my advocate would be given, and not otherwise. There was no answer to this letter, hence I concluded that no trial would be held on my case, at least on the day appointed.

These were the reasons for which I did not appear; I desired nothing more than to be present the day, at the place and hour appointed, provided a just and legal opportunity of defending myself might be granted. I do declare again, by these presents, that I was prepared on these conditions. Therefore I have not acted through contempt or contumacy, or any fault, of which I was conscious to myself, or any diffidence of success, or of any disrespect towards you;—and, whereas

you are determined to injure and treat me so cruelly :—

I, the under signed, parish priest of Oniug and Templeorum, do, on this day, the 20th of December, 1816, in my own cause appear before you, the *archbishop of Dublin*, T. J. Troy, my metropolitan, and do appeal from your sentence, as being null and void, and purporting to dismiss my appeal against the sentence of my bishop, Kyran of Ossory, and exonerate the same prelate, to the Holy See; and for this purpose, as a matter of right, I demand the reverential Apostoli instantaneously.

LAURENCE MORRISSY.

Parish priest of Oning and Templeorum, in the diocess of Ossory.

To the most ILLUSTRIOUS and most Rev. T. J. Troy, archbishop of Dublin, my metropolitan.

I delivered this appeal to Doctor Troy, in Dublin, at his own house, in presence of *Doctor Murray*, coadjutor bishop, and the Rev. *Mr. Coleman*, if I recollect right, and another gentleman, who *witnessed* the delivery of said appeal.

Doctor Troy refused to receive it, and give the Apostoli to the Holy See!! I then returned to the country and prepared my appeal for Rome. I got my case authenticated before *the Lord Mayor of Dublin, the Right Hon. Mark Bloaham*, and posted it for *propaganda de fide*, on the 25th of December, 1816, with a letter to my advocate there. In the

course of some time after, Doctor Troy changed his mind, and sent me the following Apostoli, when he knew that I was determined to apply to Rome:

Rede. Domine—Quando, &c.

Rev. Sir,—When, on the 23d of last month, together with your procurator, John Wogan, you came here, and delivered to *us* your appeal, in the presence of the most Rev. Daniel Murray, *our* coadjutor, and the Rev. Doctor Martin Hugh Hamell, our vicar general, who were with *us* on a matter of great importance, *we* could not then, through hurry say much, but told you that *we* would not grant you the Apostoli, when *we* did not pass any sentence on your former appeal, or mark yourself with any censure, and at the same time told you that you may apply to the Apostolic See, if you wished, to which you had appealed. *We* will now point out what you have advanced concerning the dismissal of your former appeal to *us*, and the relaxation of your bishop from it, and of other matters contained in your last.

We really wonder, that you require a copy of the charges to be preferred against you, when you know full well that they are contained in your suspension; besides, when you appealed to *us* from the sentence of your bishop, it was rather your business, as the *actor* in the case, to mention distinctly against him the grievances and oppressions you complain of.—With regard to a lay advocate in defending your cause, you are fully aware,

22

that your procurator *Wogan*, wrote to your bishop, on the 21st of September, that you retained a certain *anti-Catholic advocate*, whom he named, to defend your cause before us, and that we, by Doctor Marum of Ossory, signified to you that we would not permit any layman, especially a *Heretic* who is ignorant of our canon laws, to plead the mere ecclesiastical cause of either party; and that there is no example in Ireland, from time immemorial, of any layman to undertake the defence of any man in a Catholic ecclesiastical cause. You have alledged, that none of the clergy could be found to espouse your cause, through a dread of displeasing your bishop, Doctor Marum, and thereby suffering persecutions. Mr. Wogan, your procurator, wrote a letter from Carrick to Doctor Marum, informing him, that you, only on that day received his letter, written on the 24th of the same month, acquainting you that a lay advocate would not be taken in your cause; concerning this, you ought to remark that Carrickonsuir is not that great distance from Kilkenny, but you could receive your bishop's letter, written on the 24th, the day following, or at least on the 26th, through the ordinary course. Your procurator, *Wogan* delayed the answer to the 28th which was Sunday. Therefore it is to be justly concluded, that this was *designedly done*, for the *sake of deception*; for it was impossible for me, who left Dublin on the 29th, very early in the morning, to receive any know-

ledge of this letter before my arrival in Kilkenny on the 30th. What you have said about dread is futile and vain. For, what had the clergy of any of the neighbouring diocesses, viz. Waterford or Cashel, or any other throughout the kingdom to dread, to whom you could apply, besides the diocess of Ossory? *We* really doubt, that you applied to any priest to espouse your cause; or if you did, that he did not refuse through dread, but because he, perhaps, foresaw that your case was bad. Let the case be what it may, *we* grant you the Apostoli, if you wish, to apply to the Apostolic See.

BR. J. THOS. TROY.

Roman Catholic archbishop of the province of Dublin.

Given in Dublin, 4th January, 1817.

Rev. L. Morrissy, Oning

I am sorry to be obliged to disprove, and animadvert on several passages in the metropolitan's Apostoli;—

1st. The archbishop says, “that I came with my procurator John Wogan, and delivered him an appeal in the presence of Doctor Murray and Doctor Hamell, who were with him on business of importance, and therefore, had only time to tell me, in few words, that he would not grant the Apostoli; whereas, he passed no sentence on my appeal, or censured myself.” First, I have to remark that my procurator, Mr. Wogan, was not with me on that day; my witness was Mr. * * * of Dublin. 2dly. That Doctor

Hamell was not with Doctor Troy (as he, D. T. declares) during the time I was in his house on that day ; my witness and I met Doctor Hamell on his way to Doctor Troy's, after our departure. Our mutual conference on the subject held near half an hour ; his lordship did not seem to be in that extraordinary hurry *he pretended*, especially as a member of his consistory (Doctor Hamell) was then absent. If he (D. T.) passed no censure (as he avows) on my appeal, what was the import of his dismissal ? “ *Per presentes declaramus*, by these presents, *we* declare that you have deserted your appeal, and lost your cause, *we* dismiss your troublesome appeal, and *we* exempt your bishop from the same.” Can there be any sentence more positive, more annulling, or more definitive against any appeal ? And still he denies here what he had asserted before, and now grants what he had denied before!!! Viz. he denied giving the Apostoli first, because, (*if we can rely on his veracity*) he says he passed no sentence, &c. and now he grants the said Apostoli, and thereby acknowledges the fact of passing a sentence according to the nature of the case. *A curious heterogenous phraseology!!!* The archbishop continues and says, “neither did we censure you, &c.” For non-attendance (although being prevented by himself, as I have asserted before) he publicly announced, “*We vehemently* reproached your conduct before all present.” I ask any man of common

sense, is this public condemnation *a real* censure or not?

2dly. "We are surprised that you demanded a copy of the charges to be preferred against you by your bishop, whereas you know they are fully specified in your suspension." I deny the fact, and shall prove the contrary. The charges Doctor Marum publicly preferred against me in my parish chapel, on the 18th June, 1815, were quite distinct and antecedent to the charges he suspended me for, which were, "For interrupting me in the chapel of Oning, the 18th June, 1815, and subsequently, for absenting yourself for some days from the parish, and once from conference, I suspend you for three months." Now these charges, exclusively specified in my suspension, were not in existence when *he unmercifully and perfidiously*, without judge or jury, announced before the public, "that, he had received many charges against me, for which I should be tried before his *own jury*." It was for those charges (of which I always considered myself innocent) I applied, and not for these mentioned in my suspension: therefore Doctor Troy's astonishment at my demand of charges is almost *as erroneous and extravagant* as the charges themselves are. It is worthy of notice, that Doctor Troy now, as well as Doctor Marum before, in his answer to my procurator's letter, confine themselves to the charges specified in my suspension, and both seem to deny the former charges spoken of in the chapel of Oning, as

they could not be established by a fair investigation. The archbishop remarks also, "that I should minutely explain, in my appeal, the crimes and charges I had against my bishop." But any man of sound judgment, who reads my appeal, will find that I have sufficiently specified them, inasmuch as the nature of an appeal requires that measure: but *the provident prelate* did not cautiously consider that a minute exposition might be too voluminous, and the charges more numerous than those preferred in the chapel of Oning.

He (D. T.) objected to a lay advocate, especially as he was considered by them a *Heretic*, or, what is worse in the estimation of Roman Catholics, an *Anti-Catholic*, and a man ignorant of the canon law, &c. Let the bishops judge as they please and say what they like, I am confident the learned barrister whom I retained as advocate, and who is one of his majesty's counsel at law, knows the canon law better than their own lay advocate. Certainly I must confess, that their advocate understands and *practises the inquisitorial canon law better*; but that his majesty's lawyer understands the real, just, and ancient canon law, not only better than their advocate, but probably better than some of the prelates themselves. Moreover the bishop says, "in a mere ecclesiastical cause:" Although censures, clerical functions, &c. annexed to benefices, are considered ecclesiastical; the possession of these benefices, the violent infraction of that possession, the

unjust and uncanonical spoliation of temporal emoluments accruing from said benefices, the moral character of the beneficiary and the foul derogation of that character, the commotions caused by such illegal proceedings among the people, are not mere ecclesiastical or spiritual things, but *matters of fact*; “*res facti, non juris, nihil spiritualitatis includentes.*”—“*Van-es-pin.*”

And, as such, any man of any persuasion, even a Deist, or an Atheist could interfere, and do justice: this is the practice of Belgium, and almost of all nations now. The able canonist Christineus says, “*Judices seculares cognoscere possunt de omni possessorio judicio, etiam beneficiorum et rei ecclesiasticæ.*” Secular judges can interfere, judge, and decide the right of all possessions, even of benefices and ecclesiastical matters. Yes, in Rome, the seat of the Roman Catholic religion, by the approbation and full consent of the Pope, cardinals, bishops, and canons, *laymen*, both *married* and unmarried, interfere, judge, and decide all the ecclesiastical and spiritual affairs and concerns of the church all over the world, as well as the clergy do. *Rome is the general depository of the intrigues, murders, injustices, perfidy, dissipation, and debaucheries of various kinds, practised and perpetrated by many priests and prelates, all over the universal church:* and with these laymen are acquainted as well as clergymen, and are appointed by spiritual superiors to examine, judge, and decide

these cases, as well as the clergy themselves are. Some of the chief judges of the Roman Catholic church are laymen, viz. some of the cardinals; and in Ireland our bishops will not allow, what is allowed by the HEAD of the church, and practised by his ministers; but reprobate, by censures and privations, a custom universally established to extend justice and prevent tyranny. Can this monopoly and usurpation be any thing less than a *schism*, as being in direct opposition to superior power and common custom; which custom they have abolished in order to have no controul over usurpation and self-arrogated power. But they will tell me that *Protestants* (whom they designate *Heretics and Anti-catholics*) are, and should be excluded; I ask, with submission, may not a *Protestant* have as clear a head, as sound an understanding, and *as good a heart* to do justice, and act conscientiously *as a Roman Catholic layman, priest, or bishop*? Yes, and we daily see convincing proofs of the fact.

Here we are in a state of fluctuation, ignorance, and misery, and shall remain so *until the legislative power shall interfere; see the subject be justified, and liberated from the trammels of episcopal subjugation.* "Nisi auxilium et remedium regium adhiberetur, gravissime opprimerentur innocentes a iudiciis ecclesiasticis." "Covarruvias." Were it not for the royal aid and royal assistance the innocent might be most grievously oppressed by ecclesiastical judges and

spiritual superiors. It is as necessary to exercise this royal interference and salutary coercion, in our days, for the good of the country and peace of the subject, as it is in any other department of life ;—for the same prelate, in the same Apostoli says, “that there is no example of lay interference, on such occasions, to be found from time immemorial in Ireland.” Admitting the fact, what was the cause? *the artfulness of bishops*, indolence of the clergy, and *passive* forbearance of the English government. The prelates desisted from holding provincial councils and diocesan synods—the election of bishops by dean and chapter, or by the clergy in general,—and canonical collations by canonical concursus ; by these ecclesiastical laws, their authority was restrained within its proper limits, and their episcopal administration regulated by the hand of justice, by clerical and civil interference ; but as soon as these restraints were removed, the prelates monopolised what was not their own, and usurped the authority which was invested in the clergy and laity, in order to promote their friends and faithful inquisitors to ecclesiastical preferments, for the accomplishment of treasonable practises and ultimate ruin of loyal subjects. The Irish clergy tamely yielded to the usurpation of their rights, and thereby lost their own jurisdiction and power, and consequently are now completely unhinged in their ecclesiastical livings, ecclesiastical rights, and temporal emolu-

ments, and are unquestionably at the mere disposal and volatile disposition of aspiring superiors and oppressive ministers. *Now the bishops laugh at both clergy and laity*, and ironically say, "that *lay-advocacy is out of the question in Ireland.*"

4thly. The archbishop, in continuation says, "that I pretended I could not get any clergyman to advocate my cause, through dread of my bishop; that this apology was futile and frivolous, whereas I could apply to some priests in other dioceses, who need not dread the bishop of Ossory." It is well known from what is already advanced, that I was always anxious to bring matters to a favourable issue and final end,—that my opponents would never consent to, but always evaded a fair investigation.—I can inform his lordship that I did apply to different clergymen in different dioceses, and among the rest to three of his own, viz. Doctor Hamill, Mr. Walsh, of Denmark-street, and one of his own curates in Liffey-street chapel; these gentlemen can inform and correct him of his rash judgment. But, they, as well as the clergymen of other dioceses, had to dread their own bishops,* and the law which prescribes that those who will assist heretics or espouse their cause, shall be treated like themselves; which law *bishops are sworn* to put in execution. Therefore other priests had to

* The prelate gives a misconstruction of his own to this part of my procurator's letter to my bishop, and says *my bishop*, in the place of *their bishop*.

dread as well as the priests of Ossory. A copy of this apostoli, dated 4th January 1817, and delivered to me the 8th of said month, Doctor Troy sent to the court of Rome, which I had seen and copied there. By this *apostoli*, the *crime* of *heresy* was established against me in that court, for retaining a *heretic* or *Anti-catholic*, &c. in my cause, (as the archbishop designated him,) And said crime was corroborated more fully and more elaborately by my bishop, Doctor Marum, in his charges against me in Rome, as shall appear in its proper place.

Now, Doctor Marum's case and mine were before the Roman court, *propaganda*, for discussion and decision. The result will appear by extracts taken from a letter written to me on the occasion, by my agent in Rome, and by the decree of the court of *propaganda de fide*.

Rome, March, 29, 1817.

Rev. Dr. Sir,

"By this post, Propaganda writes to Doctor Marum to this effect, viz. "that the holy congregation had received the bishop's account of your case, as also your appeal, affidavit, &c. That the accusations his lordship brings against you are sufficiently answered by your documents, or, at least, are not of a nature to deserve suspension, or privation of your parish. But, as it appears from representation, that some of your parishioners are displeased with you, the holy congregation orders his lordship to give you

another parish, for peace sake, because a clergyman, and particularly a parish priest, is not to be deprived of the means of subsistence. This is the substance of Propaganda's letter. Wait on his lordship, and inform him that you understand that Propaganda de fide has decided in your favour, and request your reinstatement, &c.

I remain, Rev. Dear Sir,

your most obedient humble servant

To the Rev. L. Morissy, Oning.

This favour I received on the 23d of April following. As this letter and that of Propaganda to my bishop, ordering my reinstatement, were sent off by the same post from Rome to Ireland; of course both should be received at the same time, in the same district: I waited on Doctor Marum the following day (24th) to know his answer, *who said that he received no documents or orders from Rome on the occasion!!!* I requested of his lordship to inform me when he would receive them; his answer was, "I will do whatever I shall consider my duty requires; I shall act as I think proper," &c. In the course of five days after (29) I called on him again, and made similar application, in a submissive manner; his reply was again, "I am not to be catechised by you, *I will not tell you* whether I did or did not, I shall do as I think proper," &c. The third time, I brought with me a witness, on the 7th of May, to know his final sentiments relative to my restoration, according to the decision of

Propaganda—his declaration was, "I will let you know my sentiments and determination, when it shall answer my convenience."

In the first place, Doctor Marum treats a priest with more tyranny and oppression than the *master* does *his slave*, or the *king* *his subject*, or the *Pope* *his clergy*.

2. He exalts himself above all the powers on earth,—“I shall do as I please, I shall treat you as I wish,” &c. and considers himself on an *equality* with the *Most High*. He speaks as if he was infinitely above a priest in dignity and jurisdiction, when, at the same time, he can do nothing that a clergyman cannot do, but merely to confer holy orders. St. Augustine says, “that it is *by custom* that *any distinction* was made between a priest and a bishop, for both are priests and fallible men.”

Doctor Lanigan (by permission) was to send one of his clergymen, throughout his diocese to confirm the children, when he was, through indisposition, unable to discharge that pastoral function. The neighbouring bishops felt indignant that the laity should know that any clergyman besides themselves, could confer the “sacrament of confirmation;” and of course, were apprehensive that their authority and influence among the people might be lessened thereby; consequently they wrote to Doctor Lanigan, requesting he would prevent this innovation and intrusion on their power, and that they

themselves would confirm in his diocess ; a specimen of *spiritual jealousy and exclusive arrogance* ; they prevailed, and confirmed in Ossory.

In the first instance, a master cannot treat his slave according to his own vindictive will, and mere pleasure, he cannot withhold the means of his existence, he cannot take away his moral character, and punish him for making a proper defence ;—all this inhuman treatment Doctor Marum has been guilty of, in as much as he possibly could ; therefore he has behaved towards me more tyrannically, &c. than a master could towards his slave.

2dly. The king cannot treat his subject as he likes, he cannot deprive him of his natural life by starvation, he cannot prevent him from procuring an honest livelihood in his native soil, or in a foreign country—all this Doctor Marum has done, to the utmost of his power ; he has endeavoured to deprive me of life, by taking away the bread of life, he has actually deprived me of my property without a just cause, without a legal or canonical trial ; he has, as much as possible, prevented me from procuring a livelihood elsewhere ; for there is a most unjust, despotic, and impious law or canon established among the bishops all over the world, viz. “that when a priest is rejected, degraded, and turned away by his bishop, *let him be right or wrong, act canonically or uncanonically, no matter by or from what motive ;*

no other bishop will receive him, will give him faculties to answer the end of his vocation, or allow the faithful to contribute towards the preservation of his temporal existence!!! And, by virtue of this law, Doctor Marum has treated me with more severity and oppression than any monarch could, or, I am sure, would his subject.

3dly. As well as the civil law prevents the prince from acting despotically and unjustly, so does the ecclesiastical law (*the inquisition excepted*) prevent the POPE from acting despotically and tyrannically; from suspending, degrading, despoiling, &c. without a just cause, canonically proved, &c. Notwithstanding, Doctor Marum did what the Pope could not in conscience or by the true canons of the church do; but, behold, Doctor Marum has extended his power and tyranny farther than all the monarchs on earth could, with justice and equity do. God alone can, with justice and pre-eminence take away what he has given, and deprive a man of his existence by his own free will, and divine justice. But, as the public well know, my bishop has taken from me, without a just cause, the exercise of all the spiritual powers and clerical faculties God gave me in his church;—all the temporal means I received from the bountiful hands of divine Providence—in a word, of all that heaven and earth did bestow, life and grace excepted.

After the repeated applications I made for my reinstatement, and the repeated denials

and ignominious treatments I experienced from my prelate, I wrote to Cardinal Litta, prefect of Propaganda, on the 23d May, 1817. for his cordial advice, and further interference, who, on the 14th of June after, sent me the following decree of Propaganda de fide, concerning my reinstatement; with directions to make application on the occasion, &c.

Revde. Dne.—“*Sacra hæc congregatio minime expedire putavit judicium instruere in causa appellationis abste interpositæ adversus episcopum, ob ademptam tibi parœciam de Oning atque Templorum; sed eidem visum est opportunius Revmo. Ossoriensi episcopô mandare, ut, quoniã Do. Tua ab omni crimine sese purgavit, te ad aliam parœciam, ne ad mendicitatem redigaris, transferri curet; quod quidem per litteras 29 Martii, pr. 81. eidem presuli significatum fuit. Oportet igitur, ut Do. Tua episcopum adeat, eumque humiliter deprecetur, ut, juxta S. congregationis sententiam, aliam tibi parœciam conferat; ac dum minime dubito, quin ipse et nostris, et tuis votis prompte satisficiat, deum precor, ut fausta tibi omnia, et præcata concedat.*

Romæ, ex ædibus S. Congregationis de Propaganda fide, die 14 Junii, 1817.

Studiosissimus,

LAUR. CARD. LITTA, Præfectus.

C. M. PERICINI, Secretarius:

Rou. D. Laurentio Morrissey, Presbytero Ossoriensi, in Hibernia, Carrick-on-suir.

I shall translate the substance of this letter or decree, into English.

Rev. Sir, —“ This sacred congregation did not think it expedient to enter into judgment, in the case of your appeal, against your bishop, for taking from you the parish of Oning and Templeorum; but it appears to us more prudent *to command the bishop of Ossory to give you another parish, because you have proved yourself innocent of every crime*: which decree we have notified to him in writing, on the 29th of last March. It behoves you therefore, to go to your bishop, and humbly pray, that he should give you another parish, in conformity to the sentence of the sacred congregation: and we have no doubt, but he will comply with your request and our wishes; and we pray God that you may succeed and prosper in all things.”

Given in Rome, at the college of the S. Congregation of Propaganda, the 14th day of June, 1817.

I am, Rev. Sir;

your most obedient humble servant,

LAUR. CARDINAL LITTA, Prefect.

C. M. PEDICINI, Secretary.

To the Rev. Mr. Morrissy, Priest of Ossory,
in Ireland, Carrick-on-suir.

Here, as you see, the sacred congregation declared *me innocent, and of course my bishop guilty*, for his bad treatment, &c. Why not then treat both, as the sacred canons require; the reason is obvious, viz. in order to support the superior and humble the subject for political views and temporal interest. The just canons require, “that a

man factiously and tyrannically deprived of his benefice, should be reinstated in the very same parish he was deprived of." 2d. "that restitution should be made him in full of all his temporal losses." And 3dly. "that his character, insidiously injured, should be repaired by the aggressor and calumniator.

In the second place, the canons require, "that the culprit should be deprived of his own benefice, and rendered incapable of holding any in future, and should never be absolved until the necessary restitution of both character and property would be made in full. *Con. Trid. &c.*—God help the miserable man, who pronounces invalid absolutions over the guilty head of * * *. If these canons were put in force, the court of Rome would lose one of her best servants, and *most active inquisitors in Ireland*, and *that would not do!* she should deprive him of his diocese, and of all his jurisdictions and faculties, and that would neither *answer the end in view!!!* If the said canons were strictly adhered to, the loyal man would be supported, and re-established in a situation wherein he could practise fidelity, and reprove disloyalty, which would be likewise repugnant to the *system*—the *inquisitor* would be humbled and rendered incapable of disseminating insubordination, and engendering a spirit of revolution against lawful authorities, and much less would that suit the purpose of foreign power and domestic enemies—for these reasons the sacred congre-

gregation said, "*minime expedire iudicium instruere.*" It is not expedient, neither do we wish to enter into the merits or demerits of this case, otherwise we should condemn and expose the bishop, and exalt the loyal man; a measure entirely repugnant to our present system, &c. But we will gloss the business over, by doing something for the man we pronounced innocent, especially as his case is *known to the Protestants of his country*, and stamped with the *broad seal* of the Lord Mayor of Dublin; we will only order his bishop to give him another parish, in order to escape suspicion and censures—"another parish rather than his own, that it may not appear, his bishop would be too much humbled in the face of the public." I received the above decree of the court of Rome in the ordinary course of time, and, conformably to the cardinal's desire, shewed it to Doctor Marum, on the 17th of July following the date thereof, in the presence of the Rev. John Prendergast of Clonmel, in the diocese of Lismore, who incurred the displeasure of some of his brethren for this act of humanity, and for not being stamped with the same prejudice as they were. I supplicated, in an humble and docile manner, my appointment to another parish. *He promised, before the above reverend gentleman*, to comply, and make an immediate arrangement. On the 30th inst. (July) he appointed a clergyman to my parish, after foisting into said living before, two good sound determined

inquisitors, Carrol and Cody; and the same day, he ordered my curate to inform me, that he wanted to have an interview with me on the following day.—The poor disappointed curate, who often before wiped off showers of sweat from his face in *running the race*, in order to gain the contended prize, (the parish) wrote the following note :

Rev. Dr. Sir,—“ Doctor Marum, both your bishop and mine, commissioned me, on this day to inform you, that he expects that you will wait on him to-morrow in Mouncoyne, or at farthest, on Friday in Dangan.

I remain, Rev. Sir, yours truly,

RICHARD MANSFIELD.

Piltown, July 30, 1817.

To Rev. L. Morrissy, Carrick.

The day after (31st) at our interview in Mouncoyne, he gave me the parish of Ballyragget, in compliance with the sentence of *Propaganda*, as he declared. The Rev. *Mr. McGrath* was witness to this appointment, and was desired by the bishop, D. M. to go with me to Ballyragget, and introduce me from the altar to the parishioners, on the Sunday following, the 3d of August as their parish priest. I then left the bishop with good grace, reciprocally forgiving and forgetting, (as I thought) all former feuds and animosities; and, with great joy, acquainted my friends of the happy chage and reconciliation that took place; who, together with all the surrounding neighbourhood, were extremely glad, that there was an end to all the abuses

and scandals occasioned by oppression and usurpation. I immediately began to make the necessary preparations for my journey to Ballyragget; I was just ready to set out the following day, (1st of Aug.) for my late parish, and take possession of said benefice, when, at the same moment, I received the following note from my bishop.

Dangan, July 31, 1817.

Rev. Sir,—In my interview with you this day at Mouncoyne, I omitted, from hurry perhaps, some observations which I judge now necessary to make to you; I, therefore, request you will have the goodness to meet me again, on tomorrow at Mouncoyne, where I am to bless a cemetery, about 11 o'clock.

I am yours, &c.

K. MARUM.

I went to him according to request; at our interview, the following colloquy took place: "I received (said the prelate) a letter from Rome since I saw you yesterday, I am not commanded by it to give you a parish; in place of the word *mandare* in the cardinal's letter to you, it is *hortari* I find in the letter I received. Even in case I was commanded, I am not bound to obey any authority on earth, in giving you a parish,—bishops cannot be compelled to give parishes to those, whom they do not like to prefer; go to the *Retreat* as I have advised before, abide by the orders I shall give, and in the course of time, I may make some provision for you,

but I shall never give you a parish." I told his lordship I should most cheerfully go to all the retreats he would establish for his clergy in general, if he would act candidly and vouchsafe to give me previous notice as he usually gives others, throughout his diocese.

He did not call on me for the space of two years previous to that period, or since, to attend conferences or spiritual retreats a long with the diocesan clergy. I, also, explicitly told him I would abide by the order Propaganda gave, *and* at the same time should obey him as a prelate ought to be obeyed. Remark this direct contradiction and palpable deception!! viz. Doctor Marum writes to me, requesting an interview in consequence of the *omission of some observations, not made the day before*, at the time he conferred on me the parish of Ballyragget, and tells me the following day, that his reason, in requesting this personal interview was, *in consequence of a letter he received in the interim from Rome*. Would not the common lebeian blush at such palpable untruths and double dealing!!! The *sole* cause of requiring this interview was in consequence of missions made yesterday, and the *entire* cause, of the same interview, is, this day, the single word in a letter received from one of the clerks of Propaganda de fide. The cause alledged yesterday, *does not exist to-day*, or the cause adduced this day was *not in existence yesterday* when the parish was con-

ferred; and in case it might be antecedent or subsequent, it was not either directly or indirectly sufficient to annul the act of collation which took place, as already specified, or disobey an absolute command and final decree, from the head of the church to a subject. *Why did not Doctor Marum shew me his letter (if he received any) with the word 'Hortari' in it?* He should produce his authority, as I had produced mine; his *spot dixit* would not do in a case of such importance. Admitting that he received this letter, I ask what is the great difference between the word *mandare* and *hortari*, to command, and to counsel, advise, recommend, desire, or request, &c. from a superior to an inferior and a subject. Does not the word *hortari* to desire, recommend, &c. imply obedience and compliance? If not, parish priests and coadjutors are not bound to obey their bishops, when they recommend, desire, or request of them to do any thing.

Doctor Marum desires an interview with me alledging, as the sole cause, some omissions concerning my appointment to the parish of Ballyragget the day before: with prompt obedience I waited on his *lordship* to know the nature of these omissions aluded to, he shrugs his shoulders, hems and haws; as soon as his agitation subsides, he, by the *hocus-pocus* of his episcopal power converts his *omissions* in Mouncoyne yesterday, into a letter (received since from *his agent in Rome*;) and now grounds the cause of taking from

me the parish he conferred the day befoe, on one solitary word, *hortari*, to advise, &c. contained in the pretended letter, which word should be in itself a sufficient cause of appointment.—Who can read this unadorned narrative and base act, without feeling for the temerity, weakness and duplicity of the bishop of Ossory: *Name it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon!!!* This subject reminds me of what a bishop said once in my presence to a coadjutor; “Sir, there is a vacancy for a curate in the parish of—— if you wish you may go there.” The coadjutor thought, by the bishop’s expressions, that it was optional with him to go, or decline going to the parish, and, therefore, for just and plausible reasons, he did not go. The prelate afterwards, informed the miserable coadjutor “that he was guilty of a grievous sin in disobeying even the *insinuations* of his bishop, and for that reason could not be absolved!!!” What then must a man be guilty of who disobeys the *court of Rome* and the *head of his church*, as my Ossorian prelate did? The poor curate trembled and almost fell under the weight of this heavy judgment pronounced by his bishop; though he ought to know that the ordinary of the diocess had nothing to do with his appointment, according to the canon law, which prescribes that parish priests should choose their own coadjutors, this is the law, and even the custom in the city of Rome. The pastors could and ought to insist on this right of appointment,

and support their own authority. Doctor Marum says, that bishops are not bound, in obedience to any superior authority, to give benefices to any, except to such as they like themselves. An alarming *declaration* to the *coadjutors of Ireland*. The practice of bishops proves the fact: for, what is more common than to promote young clergymen to livings before old curates; *ignorant and dumb dogs** before learned and zealous priests, cringing sycophants, friends and relatives before men of candour, religion and merit. The disappointed and insulted coadjutors could insist on the establishment of a concursus where the council of Trent is received. They could insist on just and equitable promotions where it is not received. They could not be opposed, or, at least, refused in claiming justice and preventing the usurpation of their rights. What a dreadful account must prelates render another day for the abolition of the salutary laws of the church, viz. deans and chapters, councils and synods, vicar generals, concursus, &c. I am not astonished at what the great Alban Butler has said in his Posthumous works. *In my opinion*, said he, *there will be but few bishops saved. Any man who doubts the assertion, let him compare their lives and works, with the lives and works of the apostles, their zeal and piety, with the zeal and piety of the antient fathers, their inquisitorial laws, with the laws of the Gospel; and then let him*

* Thus the Scripture terms all priests, who neither teach or preach the word of God.

candidly declare whether he will coincide, in opinion, with *Alban Butler*.

The prelate ended his conference with me at Dangan this day by ordering me again into the former dismal retreat, and requiring I should afterwards abide by his instructions, &c. and that he might, thereby do something for me at a future period. To go into this retreat would be, perhaps, the same thing as to go into the inquisitorial catacombs, exhaling a cataclysm of episcopal *fury*, episcopal *revenge*—in despairing anguish, waiting for the orders alluded to; orders, as might be dictated by the *ministers* and executed by the *officers* of the *Ossorian Tribunal*—Languishing in a state of despondence, waiting for a provision to be made, *probably an eternal provision*, which would ultimately put an end to all disputes. Thus did I return from the doctor, after depriving me of the parish he gave the day before. This act of oppression was perhaps more cruel and tyrannical than any perpetrated hitherto! What a mortification and distress, for a man to return back in the evening, quite disappointed, and face his friends, of whom he took his leave in the morning, when going to take possession of his living. On the 6th inst. (August) I wrote to cardinal Litta and my agent in Rome, and acquainted both of Doctor Marum's non compliance with the *decree* of Propaganda with respect to my reinstatement, and of the ignominious treatment I received from him. In the regular course of time I

received a letter from my agent, stating the particulars of his interview with the Cardinal Prefect on this subject, who, through political motives, appeared to be apprehensive of incurring the displeasure of the Irish bishops, by insisting on my reinstatement. When the prelates saw that I had succeeded in Rome, they were alarmed, and concluded that my success would be an encouragement to the rest of the clergy to oppose them in their ecclesiastical government, and prevent their absolute controul over the clergy and laity. Therefore, they represented in Rome that the second order of the clergy had become of late, very refractory and quite disobedient to their spiritual superiors, and for that reason, that it was imperative on the *Holy See* to defend and support their authority and jurisdiction. I was informed in the imperial city that the principal reason the court of Rome has for being so indulgent to the bishops of Ireland, and for permitting them, with impunity, to transgress the sacred canons of the church, is for fear they might, by displeasing and punishing them, join the government of these countries against the ecclesiastical power of that court, and that the inquisitorial system may not, for that reason, be supported and upheld by the concurrence and co-operation of the Irish prelates. The cardinal spoke to this effect to my agent in Rome, and informed him, that it behoved the *Holy See* to support the authority of the bishops of Ireland against the refractory conduct of the

second order, &c. Thus frustrated and overwhelmed with difficulties and dismay, I rested for some time on the bed of sorrow and grief.

In some time after, I formed a resolution to appeal to the Head of all, the POPE. For this purpose, I was encouraged by two clergymen who were intimately acquainted with the ecclesiastical intercourse between this country and Rome, and said, if I would consent to send a certain sum of money to two certain advocates in Rome, (whom they would recommend,) I would, in all probability, be reinstated. According to their advice and directions I sent the sum required by them, which was considerably larger than was necessary or usual on such occasions, and beside, I had rewarded themselves liberally at home for their pretended good wishes towards me. A certain lay inquisitor joined them in the scheme. The appeal was sent off to Rome together with the sum alluded to, and a request made of giving an acknowledgment of the receipt of said sum, and an account of the result of the appeal. By arrangement, (for certain reasons) the communication was first to be made to one of these clergymen, and from him to me, —since that day to the present moment these clergymen never acquainted me of the result of my appeal, or receipt of my money, though several letters were received by them concerning this business and their own. When I went to Rome, my friends there said that

I sent much more money to my agent than was usual, and requested I should call for the overplus—accordingly I made the application, the agent informed me that this money was sent him for the purpose of transacting other business as well as mine ;—what was this business ? Hear !—One of these clergymen was postulating for a bishopric in Ireland ; if this was obtained, the other canvassing priest was to be preferred to the first living and first dignity in the diocess after *his lordship* ; the lay inquisitor's son, then a candidate, was to be ordained, and afterwards to be promoted : and it was to accomplish these desirable objects, that this large sum was necessary to be sent to Rome, without my knowledge, as I understood afterwards. The agents appointed declared to me in the presence of witness, that it was to the Prefect of Propaganda my appeal was given, and not to the Pope, to whom it was wrote and directed. The principal man among these agents was a clergyman—who can be confided in, when *priests* are capable of practising such *deception* ?

At length, when frustrated in all my expectations, persecuted and oppressed by all superiors at home, I made up my mind to seek abroad what I could not find at home, in the Roman Catholic Church of Ireland ;—common justice, humanity, or mercy !—I set out on my way for Rome ; but, unhappily, “ *I stepped from the frying pan into the fire.* ” During my long journey I did not

officiate or celebrate Mass, which I earnestly wished to do, and could perform in many large towns and cities I travelled through, had I the letters of my ordination, which bishops are bound to give, *sub mortali*, under a grievous sin, to those they ordain, as they are the true documents to prove that a man is canonically ordained, and thereby entitled to officiate, &c. Without these letters a clergyman cannot or should not get permission to exercise his clerical functions in any strange country, for fear of being an impostor, &c. I did not get said letters from the bishop who ordained me, neither did many other clergymen in Ireland. A farther proof of episcopal tyranny, and non-observance of the ecclesiastical law.

After my arrival in Rome, I made application to the sacred congregation for permission to celebrate, who knew perfectly well, from the nature of my case, that I was a clergyman, and therefore gave the permission required, to officiate in any church in the city, or the Roman district; though I was deprived of that privilege at home by their inferiors. After spending some time in the city, forming acquaintances, and acquiring competent knowledge of the steps I should take, according to the custom and usage practised there on similar occasions; I made application to the Prefect of the court of Propaganda for my rights and privileges; the result of our conversation on the subject was;—to send in an appeal to the court, and

that he would move the adjustment in Congress. I wrote and sent my appeal to the court in the month of May, 1818, which was handed by one of the secretaries, Mr. Galliazzi, to the Cardinal Prefect, who laid it before the congregation of cardinals in Propaganda. The result on that day was, "that nothing could be done for me, until I should produce my documents sufficiently authenticated, and therefore that it was necessary I should go back to Ireland for this authenticity, or procure it in some other satisfactory manner." I objected, and remarked, that the measure required was impracticable, in consequence of the extraordinary length of the journey, and the want of means to perform it. They insisted on the performance of this requisition, or otherwise that I should desist from any further proceedings. I asked, were the bishop's documents authenticated? they said not, but that the word of a bishop was sufficient for them, but not that of a priest. I asked again could not the assertion of a clergyman be relied upon as much as that of a bishop, the reply was *not by any means*. These insurmountable difficulties were opposed to prevent any further proceedings, and to accelerate my return to Ireland, or change my course to some other country; and thereby exonerate my bishop and support the *Irish inquisition*. Then the common cry was! *is he gone, what is delaying him! his business is done!!* Notwithstanding I would not quit, but was

still seeking for redress and claiming justice, where it was not to be found. At the same time, I wrote the following memorial to the Prefect of the court, where my case was agitated before, and handed it in person to him in his palace at Piazza S. Apostolorum.

My Lord Cardinal,

My unlimited confidence in your benevolent bosom, and in your paternal interference in behalf of the oppressed subject, emboldens me again to address your eminence, and supplicate for that justice you usually extend to the injured party.

My bishop, immediately after being invested with episcopal authority, required I should resign my parish into his hands, without any commutation, recompence, or equivalent; which benefice he intended for a near relative of his own, as report states and facts prove. I refused to comply with this unjust and unreasonable demand; therefore, through a spirit—he used all the possible means, and adopted all the effectual measures the human mind could devise, both for my destruction, and the accomplishment of his own private views. He deprived me of a rich benefice, without a previous or subsequent trial, by his own mere fiat:—no support allowed, no provision made for my maintenance, during the long period of more than three years; a treatment almost tantamount to death,—a tedious martyrdom. To draw a veil of deception over injustice, and to give

an external appearance of truth and equity to uncanonical and illegal proceedings, he and his accomplices encouraged some irregular priests, and disaffected laymen to conspire against me, and furnish a catalogue of ungrounded, and fabricated charges, for the accomplishment of *preconcerted measures*. I repeatedly demanded a copy of the charges preferred against me, for the sole purpose of making a defence, but could not obtain it from my bishop: the greatest culprit, and most ignominious offender could not be denied such a legal request, nor could be treated by any other authority so cruelly, and so harshly. This unjust denial is a demonstrative proof that the alledged charges are false and ungrounded; otherwise Doctor Marum would gladly embrace the favourable opportunity of bringing home a conviction of guilt against the object of his execration, and thereby justify his own *conduct* before the public at large. I am sorry he does not, more seriously, consider himself obstinate and guilty of *disobedience* to the *Holy See*, by positively refusing to reinstate me according to the mature and deliberate *decree* of *Propaganda*, enacted the 29th of March, 1817, and immediately directed to him. He has notified, that bishops are not bound, in obedience to the sacred congregation, or any other authority to give a benefice to, or reinstate any, but such as they wish themselves:—this non-compliance with the orders of *Propaganda*, and this assertion of exemption from that power, obe-

dience, and subordination, which the whole Roman Catholic world acknowledge and submit to, have given rise to several serious conjectures in the kingdom of Ireland, among all classes and denominations of the people ; viz. " that if Doctor Marum will be permitted with impunity to broach and maintain this doctrine, to violate the decrees and commands of ecclesiastical superiors, and deprive priests of the essential means of their temporal subsistence, Propaganda will lose all her power and influence over the subject in Ireland ;—that the second order must necessarily look for justice against injustice, from some other source ; and, that confusion and disorder must naturally result from this unprecedented example of a Roman Catholic bishop, in the violation of that obedience, always due to the head of the church." I am confident that Propaganda will not permit, I should return to Ireland under any existing circumstances, or unsettled state of the privations of sacred rights and ecclesiastical possessions, which would ultimately confirm the foregoing opinions in the minds of all British subjects in that country.

I am satisfied to abide by the law of the church. I am convinced if my bishop would seriously and dispassionately consider the importance of that law, of what it requires, and, also, the nature of that authority, that can command obedience and enforce compliance, he would not hesitate to reinstate me immediately, and fulfil the sacred canons of the

Roman Catholic church: "spoliatus ante omnia restituendus est, in pristinum statum. Qui sine forma judicii per canones præscripta expulsus est, sine judicio restituendus est, Ferraris." After this reinstatement in my parish, which is required by ancient and modern canons, I would then abide by the consequence of any equitable trial and impartial investigation, even in the parish, where all the public and private circumstances of this long protracted contest could be clearly and satisfactorily proved without any tergiversation. Admitting that I was guilty of some faults, even of a serious nature, I should imagine that the ill treatment I received, and being, I may say, banished from my country, deprived of my living, and under the necessity of travelling, to the great risk of soul and body, to the center of unity and source of justice, to obtain redress for past grievances, and claim protection against future injustice, are sufficient to expiate all in the eyes of God and man. I am at a loss to know how I can possibly live; all my resources are almost exhausted; I have no patrimony, no friends to support me. I cannot procure a livelihood by any kind of commerce or human industry, *fodere non valeo, mendicare erubesco*; therefore, it is an inevitable consequence that I must starve through want, or embrace some other state of life, which would ultimately tend to the disgrace of my church and aspersions of superiors. Still my lord, as you stand at the *helm*, the same confidence, which, ani-

mated my drooping spirits in Ireland, and inspired courage to undertake a long, dangerous and expensive journey to prostrate myself at your feet and implore mercy, cheers and elevates my mind to almost a full conviction of final success; and, that your eminence will not permit, I should return to Ireland frustrated, with empty hands and a broken heart.

Rome, August 28, 1818.

Quare,

To the most Rev. most illustrious, and most eminent Cardinal Litta, Prefect of Propaganda.

For

LAURENCE MORRISSY.

The cardinal read this memorial attentively, affixed his name to it, and requested I should give it to the first secretary of Propaganda de Fide, Pedicini; who was, by orders, to hand it to the cardinals at their first meeting in Propaganda. The Prefect seemed now to be somewhat interested in my favour. At the following congress it was proposed by some, to appoint a bishop in Ireland for the investigation and adjustment of this business. By others that measure was opposed, who remarked, "that it could not be expected, one bishop would condemn another bishop for my sake, and therefore, that justice could

not be obtained in this case without having the business finally settled in Rome."—It would appear, at this time, that things were taking a favourable turn in my behalf, but the *inquisition* bore all before it, and would not yield to justice, religion, or reason. The result was as before, viz. "That I should produce authenticated documents, by making a retrogression to Ireland," &c. "that the bishop's word was sufficient for them, and carried more weight than an unauthenticated appeal; otherwise I should remain as I was." I asked then would the mere word of a bishop have more weight with them than the oath of a priest; they said it would not. I made immediate application for my former case, which contained my documents, they refused, and said it was against rule and custom to give any documents, once received, out of the court of Propaganda. I promised to return them after inspection,—they would not be granted; I still persevered in my solicitations, and, by repeated importunities, obtained them at last. I then made application also, for the charges preferred against me by my bishop, but was refused, through apprehension that I might take legal proceedings afterwards at home, against my bishop and his accomplices. Notwithstanding I continued my usual applications, and engaged others on the occasion, and after repeated entreaties and frequent refusals, I got the entire. I was then pretty well prepared for making another attack. Their eminences

did not know my motive for demanding my documents, which was, to shew them the authenticity required (of which authenticity they were then ignorant, as it is very probable they must have forgotten their contents, from the length of time since the case was agitated before) by the seals and signatures, oaths and affirmations, which were inserted in and affixed to the documents contained in my case. The sacred congregation were then satisfied that these documents were sufficiently authenticated. But what was then to be devised, as they saw and acknowledged that my case was satisfactorily substantiated, and Doctor Marum's case unauthenticated, and that the authenticity of the one should absolutely decide the cause for ever, and weigh down the scale in favour of the man whose case was thus substantiated, according to their own repeated declarations. Nevertheless, when they saw themselves completely hemmed in at every side, and strictly bound in honour, conscience and justice to decide in my favour, as above, the scheme adopted was to write to Doctor Marum, and to request, if possible, to get his charges authenticated, or else, that they should decide in my favour as they did before. According to the canon law and common justice, they were bound to discuss and decide as both cases stood then on the table before their eminences; especially as both parties were satisfied and required no more. Still, all this would not answer the inquisitorial views of the court of Rome.

I immediately informed my law agent of the scheme in contemplation, who had in his possession my case, and Doctor Maruti's charges against me; which I procured a little before from the court of Propaganda; he put them in his pocket, and went along with me to said Propaganda, and asked, "whether the charges he held in his hand were the real charges preferred against Mr. Morrissy by his bishop?" the reply was, "they are." He secondly asked, "whether there were any more preferred against Mr. Morrissy?" their answer was, "not any more, except ones of a minor nature, and unworthy of notice." My advocate told them, "that they had no occasion to write to my bishop for the authenticity of his charges," that "if they were not satisfied with the strong proofs I laid down in refutation of said charges, and with their own acknowledgement of my purgation from all crimes, and subsequent decree for my reinstatement, he would take up the pleading and proceed immediately on the grounds of guilt, and the authenticity of the charges preferred against me: and said he would afterwards prove that all these charges were not tantamount to one canonical crime, deserving any spoliation of ecclesiastical possessions, or privation of clerical functions." (This able advocate had no notion that there were any traces of the inquisition in this country—This is the candid opinion of all the learned and disinterested clergy and laity, whom I have consulted,

and to whom I have shewn said charges. And now every impartial reader will be able to judge of the merits or demerits of these charges and subsequent proceedings, as they shall be unequivocally laid before the public. Notwithstanding this offer and admission of guilt, by my advocate, (though not merited) they would not allow any further proceedings to take place (whereas, by this admission, it would appear on trial, that no charge among the bishop's accusations, could be considered sufficiently criminal to sanction ecclesiastical spoliation and future disqualification, except the crime of *Heresy* alone, which they did not wish publicly to alledge as the cause of my condemnation, in order to prevent the English from knowing that the inquisition was radically established and practically enforced, (as circumstances would permit the measure in these realms) until they would write to my bishop for the authenticity of his charges, or rather to know whether any thing could be found or devised besides *Heresy*, to ground their proceedings upon before the public, for the concealment of their system in the punishment of Heretics. This was the primary cause of the postponement of my trial, and the second cause was in consequence of the tertian fever I got in the month of August, 1818.

For the want of care and proper attendance this fever continued longer than usual. When in distress and very sick, a rumour was put in circulation, by some of the Irish

there, that I was very sick and wallowing in gold : this made the Romans, with whom I had ~~any~~ dealing (few excepted) very desirous to cheat me in all transactions, and charge double price for the necessaries of life—I was often obliged to change physicians, nurstenders and lodgings during my illness. Both clergy and laity combined to *torment, rob* and *aggrieve* me in this deplorable state. In the commencement of my sickness, I fainted one morning in the arms of a *priest*, who thought I was instantaneously dying, and the *same priest, robbed me*, in the afternoon, of the money I had for my support in this state of extreme necessity, in a foreign country. The people with whom I lodged, made an extraordinary charge for the necessaries procured, they positively declared, that they would double the price of my lodgings in case I should not quit their house, (though my fever was not epidemical ; no person was apprehensive, or in dread of taking it;) when I shewed my displeasure at this exorbitancy, they got exasperated, and gave me peremptory orders to quit their house immediately ; a friend of mine interfered, and remonstrated that my life would be in imminent danger, by this exposure ; nevertheless, they insisted on my departure. The man of the house declared to some of my friends, “that there was something working in him internally, for which he could not account,” insinuating thereby, that he was tempted to put an end to my existence. We were justly apprehen-

sive of the *stiletto*. My friend immediately looked for lodgings, procured them, and agreed for the price; he told the family of the house that I had the *tertian fever*; they made no objection on that account; he then got a carriage to bring me, trembling in the height of my fever, to a remote part of the city. As soon as I arrived at my new lodgings, I was immediately obliged to stretch on the bed, through perfect weakness, I scarcely had time to breathe, when the man of the house came into my room and said, I should pay a great deal more for my lodgings, than was agreed upon, or otherwise I should provide elsewhere. Now my alarms and dangers increased, I had no alternative, but to quit without any further altercation; for this is the only remedy to be adopted, by a stranger among the Romans, if he sets any value on his life. My friend had to set out again, the same day, to procure lodgings elsewhere, and left me on the flat of my back in anguish of mind and body, in the hands of merciless people, who would not hand me a glass of water to quench my thirst, in the burning heat of a violent fever. Thus did I remain languishing and fainting until my friend returned after procuring lodgings. I was again thrown into an open carriage and carried through the streets almost lifeless. At this third place I found the family of the house more civil and more kind, but still was under the necessity of leaving them in the course of some time, and go to other places

attended with the same difficulties, I have described before. At one place in particular, I was most inhumanly treated;—in the most dangerous period of my sickness, the family of the house, both men and women, gathered round my bed, when they saw me forlorn and without a friend, took the four corners of the sheet on which I laid, and swore vehemently, “that they would throw me out on the street, if I did not instantly pay them a certain sum of money,” that was neither due or legally promised them; they took away the bed covering, and left me shivering and shaking with the cold, in the depth of winter, in a raging fever. I paid the sum required, through dread of my life, and left the house the following day, by the assistance of a few friends, who carried me down stairs in their arms to the carriage, in waiting, at the door. My nursetenders would not remain with me, as I would not give them more wine and more money than they would agree for. I often fasted from an early hour in the morning until a late hour at night, quite alone, in a dreary room, without a living being that would hand me, even a glass of water, to quench my great thirst. In being thus banished from house to house and from street to street, I should sometimes remain in the open air; or go into taverns or public houses, and take some nourishment (as there was no admittance otherwise) whilst others would be procuring lodgings, and in the interim, I would be sometimes robbed of both money

and clothes. When I was altogether disappointed in friends and nursetenders, I hired a servant man, who was, without my knowledge, very fond of drinking. At this time I was beginning to recover, and felt a strong desire of taking nourishment, as is usual with convalescents; this servant often threatened me with as much cruelty and inhumanity as the families with whom I lived before did. He would desert me in the morning, without administering any aid, or leaving me a bit of sup to put in my mouth, and would not return until dark night; if I would shew any signs of displeasure, he would immediately give abusive language and threaten my life. In this deplorable situation, impelled by hunger and thirst, I would often endeavour to get out of my bed, to stand on my feeble limbs, by the help of a staff, to cover my body as well as I could, and go out in the streets to take some nourishment for the preservation of my life. On my return, I would miss my way, rising and falling, through perfect weakness, looking for my lodgings, and groping for my bed, through dark halls, and dismal rooms, knocking my head against walls and partitions, quite exhausted without aid or light, &c. In consequence of these difficulties and extreme distress, I got a relapse, and was worse than ever; then some of the clergy and laity, were in the habit of coming to see me for some time, not indeed to afford me any consolation, but to increase my afflictions; especially the clergymen, for

not complying with their wishes, in making my will, as I was despaired of, and (as they thought) had a large sum of money about me. *Self interest was* the principal cause, because *they imagined I should make my will in their favour, in a strange country.* .

I told them I made my will in Ireland, and of course, had no will to make in Rome: This apology did not satisfy, but rather increased their displeasure, they began to withdraw both their friendship and visits; even my *father confessor* forsook me, when he was disappointed in his expectations. I was now in a deplorable state, and got a complication of disorders incident to this kind of fever in that country, I was then despaired of by all; I was not able to turn or move in my bed.—In this agony, a priest came into my room, and gave positive orders to my servant, not to give me the key of my trunk, or hand me said trunk, or permit me to open it, in order to get money to buy any thing for my support, until I would comply with their wishes, and make my will; my trunk and key were kept from me near forty-eight hours, during that period I had not a fraction to purchase the necessaries of life. When I was almost dead by sickness, hunger, and thirst, (for fear of being charged with my death) they gave the key, and handed me the trunk in my bed; in this languishing state, I opened it, and found my pocket-book broke, and twenty-five pounds taken out of it. There were a few pounds more left in

another part of the trunk, which escaped their notice. My life was threatened for suspecting those I had every reason to suspect—My servant told me one night, in a menacing manner, that he was tempted to do something extraordinary, to have blood, &c.—that he would prepare himself for the perpetration of the foul deed, by drinking a certain compliment that would elevate his spirits: I was much alarmed, in my feeble and helpless state; however, Providence prevented the horrid act of the intended murder, and spared my life for a longer day. Now an account was sent to Propaganda that I was robbed and despaired of. The good members of that house said they would send me to an hospital, where reduced gentlemen and clergymen are sent for the recovery of their health. I refused to go, and said I would prefer remaining as I was, whilst I had one shilling for my support. Some of the clergy insisted I should go, and threatened compulsion in case of refusal. Some other friends advised me to the contrary, if I had any regard for my existence; I took the hint and evaded all inquisitorial snares, with the greatest precaution.

At length, providence restored, what the persecutions of insatiable enemies took away, health!!! As soon as I was able, I wrote home for some remittance, which I providentially received before the trifle left by the despoilers was exhausted. After retrieving, I resumed my former business. I enquired

at Propaganda, what was the result of their writing to Doctor Marum, my bishop, they said that he only sent the same charges again as he did before. Notwithstanding, I got no encouragement, no decision in my favour ; for a mere suspicion of the unpardonable crime of *Heresy* was sufficient for my condemnation. As I now despaired of finding any thing like distributive justice in the court of Propaganda, I made an appeal to the Pope, and went to his palace at Monte-Cavallo, to hand it in person to his *Holiness*, who received it graciously ; signed it on the 20th of April, 1819, and sent it to the congregation of council in Angelo Custode, to be tried in that court. They would not undertake the investigation and final decision of the case there, as the business was not, in the commencement put into that court ; therefore they sent the appeal to Propaganda. It may occasion surprise, that this congregation could disobey the Pope, and send my appeal to Propaganda. This might certainly appear strange, to those who do not understand the nature of the inquisition, and the influence of these tribunals over the age, mind, and passive disposition, of a man, who is bound down by solemn ties and strong engagements, to support his *inquisitorial courts*, and approve of their administration in the extirpation of Heresy. I told his *holiness*, in my appeal, that I wanted nothing but what the real and just law of the church allowed and required. But it appears in this unhappy

age, and it is an indisputable fact, grounded upon universal experience, that the present inquisitorial law and practical system of the court of Rome and church of Ireland, supercede and annul, (inasmuch as power can extend and art enforce) the divine law of God, the apostolic law of the church, and all the civil powers, and well organized constitutions of the universe.

It would seem that the word of one or two bishops in Ireland, the sentence of a few cardinals in Rome, and the assent of the chief Pontiff (perhaps without knowing the merits or demerits of the case,) are sufficient to make uncanonical proceedings canonical; unlawful practices legal; injustice justifiable; and unwarrantable persecutions both laudable and authoritative. Propaganda was displeased, and more than displeased, for my audacity in appealing to any other tribunal; still I had the audacity to attack the same court again, and call aloud for common justice.

On the 8th of May, 1819, in company with one of the canons, I handed the same appeal I gave the Pope to the secretaries of Propaganda, Pedicini and Galliazzi, a priest and a layman. They requested we should give it to the Prefect of the congregation, Cardinal Fontana. The following day (9th) we waited on his eminence, who graciously received both the appeal and ourselves. He read a part of it, and seemed to be much moved at my unjust treatment, and inclined

to do me justice; he requested we would bring it to Propaganda, and give it in charge to the first secretary, and said he should read the entire there, and carry on the suit again. —I gave the cardinal also, the charges Doctor Marum sent to Rome against me, he read them attentively in our presence, and seemed to consider them of little or no importance, until he read the charge implying HERESY, *for retaining a PROTESTANT advocate, &c.* At this charge, he shook his head three times with much concern, and then appeared to take little or no notice of the rest. We complied with his request, and left the documents with the secretary, who said they would be discussed in congress the Monday following (17th.) I called the day after the congress was held, (18) to know the result; I was informed that the said congress referred the business to a full congregation, which was to take place the ensuing month (June), and that it would be finally adjusted at that meeting. It was then resolved upon by this general congregation to make application to the Pope, in the month of August following, for the purpose of deputing a particular congregation for the adjustment and final decision of the case.

The application was made to the Pope the time appointed, who empowered Cardinal Fontana to appoint the deputation required. The cardinal, (who might be now called *malleus hereticorum*, the *mallet of heretics*, as *St. Dominick* was before now,) deputed a

certain number of cardinals, some of whom were priests, and some more laymen; but *all faithful inquisitors*, and strict observers of the inquisitorial system *supported by that court*. There was then a new case to be drawn up, for this particular deputation. My advocate made up a very strong case in Latin, consisting of forty-nine pages in folio, which was neither answered or refuted, because it was unanswerable; and therefore, the business was transacted privately, lest their present system might be *known in this country*. In this case, he pointed out to the cardinals, that I was dispossessed without a canonical fault, condemned before I was tried, and punished without conviction; that I was deprived of my spiritual faculties and pastoral functions, contrary to the sacred canons; that I was despoiled of all my temporal emoluments, contrary to common justice, and disgraced, contrary to all divine and human laws. That my bishop acted either through *ignorance* or *malice*, or perhaps through both!! That it was imperative on their eminences to punish him for abusing and perverting, so barefacedly, the laws of their church, and trespassing so disgracefully, on the rights of man. He quoted examples from different canons, at different periods, to prove that many bishops were condignly and publicly punished for similar crimes. That if their eminences would not proceed against this prelate, in consequence of the great scandal he had given, the great injury he has done

religion, and the glaring injustice done the pastor; at least, they should execute what the law of the church always requires, they should insist on the fulfilment of the law, for the sake of the law itself and support of religion:—"Spoliator non sit audiendus, nisi prius spoliatus restituatur ad totam causam, id est, in pristinam possessionem liberam; et ad omne id, quod ibi amisit: et nisi prius rem oblatam restituerit; Ferr." The spoiler or plunderer should not be heard, until the man who is plundered or despoiled is first restored to all his rights, viz. until he is fully reinstated in his former possession, and former jurisdiction; the spoiler is not to be heard, or his charges received, until he makes restitution in full for all the losses the despoiled sustained in his benefice; and in a word, until he restores what he has taken from him.

This canon cannot be denied or subverted, it bears no *epicheia*; notwithstanding, it is only observed when it suits the convenience, and promotes the interest of superiors. There is something remarkable in the conduct of superiors in this case. 1st. When this business was laid before the court of Rome, they saw that no charge, preferred against me, could be construed into a crime, except *Heresy*; they knew, from the nature of the case, that this *Heresy*, was not of a formal or positive nature, that necessity compelled me in a great measure to make application to those, whom *they* denominate *Heretics* or *Anti-Catholics*,

that if I was punished for heresy according to the rigour of their present laws, the English government might discover their designs, and therefore, they gave the decision in my favour, and ordered my reinstatement. The bishop opposed this decree, and gave the cardinals to understand that he would not obey them, because the inquisitorial law favoured him, and supported the steps he had taken. Their eminences then ordered the prelate to allow me a suitable pension ; he would not obey or give that either. This non-compliance caused a great dilemma among them in Rome, they were afraid to incur the displeasure of the Irish bishops by forcing compliance, whereas they might afterwards refuse to co-operate with them in putting the *inquisition* in force, and also might join the English government, and turn Schismatics, and thereby lessen *the influence of the holy court in these countries*.

2ly. They were in like manner apprehensive that by refusing to do me justice, and reinstate me in my ecclesiastical rights and privileges, the second order might consider my case their own, and might revolt and insist on a veto being established, and thereby place themselves under the protection of the government, for their independence and security. In this dilemma the aforesaid court joined the stronger party ; and at the same time, endeavoured to manage the business, so as not to disclose the scheme, or expose the *hostile disposition entertained towards our constitution, &c.* I received this information

from good authority, besides the steps adopted were sufficient proof of the subtle design. The method then resorted to at home and abroad, were frequent delays and vague promises, in expectation that I would in the course of time, comply with any conditions proposed, without noise or bustle; or else that continual disappointments, unrelenting persecutions and extreme distress, might shorten my days and put an end to the contest.

After the aforesaid apprehension being entertained, the S. congregation managed the business with the greatest possible ingenuity. They told my advocate before I went to Rome, that they wrote to my bishop to give me a pension, and could do no more; in Rome they told me as much; at other times they made promises of interference and of doing justice, and broke them; they often gave me unnecessary delays and extraordinary troubles, by frequent applications, repeated appeals and as many refusals, in order to cause desistance and exhaust my resources; and this prolonged the business by alternatives and vicissitudes, until I was obliged to appeal to a superior power, *the Pope*, who had his own motives as well as the rest, and gave my appeal a shove from the top of Monte Cavallo, to the valley of Angelo Custode; the congregation of council there remitted the documents to the original source, "Propaganda," at Piazza Hispana. This holy court being enraged at the idea of

bearing the burthen again and encountering unfavourable results, sent the documents to the Prefect; the Prefect sends them back again from the vicinity of Geta to the foot of Monte Pincio; then a particular congress refers the business to a general congregation of all the cardinals, who thought to lay the weight on the weak shoulders of a feeble Pope, but the chief pontiff was more sagacious, shrunk back, and gave the commission to his tried *Inquisitor*, Fontana, who appointed the particular deputation alluded to, and sent the documents to Strado Conducto, for eternal rest.

As the cardinals, who composed this particular congregation, could not withdraw or feign any further apology, from deciding the case in question, they prolonged the business from the month of August, 1819, until very near the Christmas following, thinking that some change or accident might happen that would terminate the business, and exculpate themselves from all blame and suspicion, as I had remarked before.

Now in order to afford the reader a fair opportunity of judging more judiciously of the merits or demerits of this case, and justice or injustice of the decision made by this particular congregation, I shall transcribe the charges Doctor Marum preferred against me in Rome, which I got out of the court there, and shall, in like manner, quote the refutation made of each individual charge, in order.

ACCUSATIONES CONTRA R. D. LAURENTIUM
MORRISSY DELATÆ.

*Accusations preferred against the Rev. Mr.
Laurence Morrissy.*

1st. Accusation. *Cum. D. Morrissy, &c.*
When Mr. Morrissy was greatly obnoxious to the people of Oning and Templeorum, he was often asked by his bishop, for peace sake, to go to another parish; but he pertinaciously refused, and endeavoured to keep the afore-said parish by force.

Refutation of the above charge.—Doctor Marum says, ‘that he often asked me to change to another parish;’ I do now declare before God and man that he never did, but when he asked for a resignation of my parish, he made a feigned promise of giving me another in the course of time; although he had two vacant parishes on his hands to dispose of at the same moment, and would not give or offer any of them in commutation.

I ask, is the Doctor *guilty of a palpable untruth* in the commencement of his accusations? According to the laws of the inquisition, the inquisitor wanted to deprive the supposed Heretic of the care of souls, and *flatter* him with *vain promises* of future promotion.

2dly. He says here, ‘that I was obnoxious to my parishioners:’ to prove this assertion to be an *unqualified falsehood*, I shall insert the testimonials of my parishioners, both Catholics and *Protestants*, and of several other gentlemen of both persuasions in that neighbourhood.

*The Testimony of my PARISHIONERS
in general.—1816.*

We whose names are hereunto subscribed, do candidly affirm, and solemnly declare, in justice to the moral character of the Rev. Laurence Morrissy, in vindication of our own, and in refutation of the unjust and unfounded report of our despising, abominating and calumniating him, that we (during the long period of *fourteen years* he presided over us as Pastor) always had, and do still consider him a regular, sober and exemplary Priest: zealous in the administration of the sacraments, attentive to the instruction of youth, assiduous in preaching to his flock, indefatigable in inculcating the essential virtues of obedience to the divine and ecclesiastical precepts, and strict obligation of invariably adhering to the established laws of their country.

Likewise, that he was, during the time above specified, at least, as moderate in his charges, and in the demand of his parochial dues, as the general custom and universal practice of the diocese appear to be:—

GARRET COGHLAN,	THOMAS PHELAN,
RICHARD COGHLAN,	EDMOND DURNY,
THOMAS WALSH,	JOHN FAHY,
GEORGE READE,	PATRICK BRISCOE,
JOHN COGHLAN,	JAMES MEADE,
BENJAMIN MURPHY,	JOHN LAWRENCE,
JOHN MEADE,	PETER WOODS,
PETER POWER,	JAMES SHEA,

With many more too numerous for insertion here. When my Persecutors were informed of this general Testimony, they were *enraged* that I should be considered a man of character,

as the *inquisitorial* laws of late centuries, will not allow any man to be possessed of a good name, but an *Inquisitor*, or an *Abettor of the System* described in the first part of my work. Priests threatened to punish my Parishioners for giving me good testimonials, and said they would inevitably incur the Bishop's displeasure, and provoke him to issue censures against them. My Curate attacked several of said Parishioners unwarrantably, and said he was one of the *Bishop's [Inquisitorial] Agents*. This is a further proof of the horrid law alluded to, viz.—that all Men must be bad members, (*except R. C. Inquisitors*) and therefore unworthy of a good name, and of being considered upright men in the community. This principle must be against the law of nature itself, as well as christianity.

Notwithstanding these menaces, and unchristian efforts, I got the following particular Certificates from Gentlemen of different persuasions, in and out of my Parish.

Testimonials of ROMAN-CATHOLIC Gentlemen.

I do hereby certify, that I have known the Rev. Laurence Morrissy, for several years, during which time he conducted himself as a Clergyman ought, viz. with piety, humility, and conscientiousness; and I believe him to be a loyal, faithful and honest man.

JOHN POWER, M. D.

Carrick-on-Suir, 26th August, 1820.

I have no reason in the world to doubt the above statement.

JAMES W. POWER, Surgeon.

Carrick-on-Suir, 26th August, 1820.

I have known the Rev. Mr. Morrissy, during his incumbency of the united Parishes

of Oning and Templeorum, (fourteen years) and during that period, his life was that of a pious, zealous and assiduous Pastor; his morals strictly correct and exemplary.

JOHN S. WELLS.

Kilonery, Carrick-on-Suir, August 27th, 1820.

From a long knowledge of the above named Mr. Morrissey, I cheerfully subscribe to the above given character.

PIERCE ROWE, *Surgeon.*

Carrick-on-Suir, 29th August, 1821.

I am perfectly aware that the above statements of the character of the Rev. Mr. Morrissey, are correct.

GEORGE LYNCH, *Surgeon.*

Carrick-on-Suir, 30th August, 1820.

From my personal knowledge of the Rev. Laurence Morrissey, and the universal character he has established, and justly acquired, I have no hesitation in coinciding with his Parishioners, and the neighbouring Gentlemen, in the testimonials already given him.

RICHARD HOGAN.

Carrick-on-Suir, 21st September, 1820.

I heartily coincide with the Gentlemen who have subscribed to the character of the Rev. Mr. Morrissey, having known him for many years to be always that loyal, just and upright character before mentioned,

HENRY WITHERS.

Carrick-on-Suir, 22nd September, 1820.

From my knowledge of the Rev. Laurence Morrissey, for many years, I am confident that during his administration in the Parishes of

Oning and Templeorum, he zealously discharged all the duties of a good Pastor; and since the period of his deprivation of said Parishes, his conduct has been most exemplary and unimpeachable.

JOHN HOGAN.

Carrick-on-Suir, 22nd September, 1820.

I do hereby certify, that I am conscientiously of the same opinion with the above persons.

MICHAEL BOYLE.

Carrick-on-Suir, 22nd September, 1820.

I have been acquainted with the Rev. Mr. Morrissy, for a series of years, during which time his character has been strictly moral, correct and unimpeachable.

MICHAEL HICKIE.

Dated 12th December, 1821, White-Church.

From the above general and good characters given of the Rev. Laurence Morrissy, by his Parishioners, and the opportunity I frequently have had of hearing from many more of his flock, throughout the district he lived in, for several years, that he always discharged his duty with the greatest punctuality, as a true Rector ought, and fulfilled the obligations of a faithful Pastor, I have no hesitation in believing the veracity of their testimonies, and respectability of their signatures, &c.

THOMAS F. READY.

Carrick-on-Suir, 23d September, 1820.

I had for many years established an intimate acquaintance with the Rev. Laurence Morrissy, and did not to the present period, discover any

thing reprehensible either in his public or private character.

MICHAEL A. COLEMAN.

Carriek, September 23d, 1820.

I do hereby certify, that I have these many years past, by public character, and personal acquaintance, known the Rev. Laurence Morrissey to be a zealous and exemplary clergyman in the discharge of his *pastoral functions*, and a *loyal and faithful subject*. Given under my hand this 23d day of September, 1820.

MICHAEL B. GREEN,

Carriek-on-Suir, 23d Sep. 1820.

I have been acquainted with the Rev. Laurence Morrissey since he first came to the Parish of Oning, and during that period, have always known him to support a most respectable character in every particular, which I feel happy in giving my testimony to.

EDMOND CANTWELL,

4th Nov. 1820.

25, Brunswick-st. Dublin.

Testimonials of PROTESTANT Gentlemen.

I hereby certify, that I have known the Rev. Laurence Morrissey for some years, as Parish Priest of the Union of Fidown; and have always considered him correct in his conduct, and a loyal well conducted man.

JOSEPH SAYNDS,

Fidown, August 13th, 1820.

Rector of the Union of Fidown.

From my long and intimate knowledge of the above named Mr. Morrissey, I believe the above statement correct and just.

EDWARD V. BRISCOE.

Wellmount, 14th August, 1820.

I have always entertained the highest opinion of Mr. Morrissy's character, both private and professional.

EDWARD BRISCOE, Colonel.

Wellmount, Carrick-on-Suir.

14th August, 1820.

From a long acquaintance with the Rev. Laurence Morrissy, during which time he was Parish Priest of the Union of Fidown and Témpleorum, of which this parish forms a part; I always considered him as being exemplary in his moral conduct, anxious to preserve the peace and tranquillity of the country, desirous to prevent the profanation of the Sabbath, attentive to his duties as Parish Priest, and loyal in his principles and conduct.

THOMAS MAUNSELL,

Cartlane Glebe,

Rector of Cartlane, alias White Church.

14th August, 1820.

I believe the Rev. Laurence Morrissy from my own personal knowledge of him, and the report of others capable of estimating his character, to be a peaceable, loyal man, and one likely from his principles to be a highly useful man in any place where he may be settled.

BENJAMIN COX.

Castletown, Carrick-on-Suir, 18th August, 1820.

I certify, that during the time the Rev. Laurence Morrissy resided in my neighbourhood as Parish Priest of the Union of Oning and Témpleorum, I never heard any circumstance injurious to his character in any respect.

MICHAEL COX, J. P.

Castletown, 18th August, 1820.

I hereby certify, that I have been intimately acquainted with the Rev. Laurence Morrissy, for the space of fourteen years, as Parish Priest of the Union of Oning and Templeorum; during that time I considered him very correct in his moral conduct, loyal in his principles, and attentive to his pastoral functions.

HENRY BRISCOE.

Garnarea, 19th August, 1820,

I am fully aware that the above statements are perfectly correct and true.

WILLIAM BRISCOE.

Garnarea, Carrick-on-Suir, 19th August, 1820.

I have known the Rev. Laurence Morrissy as long as I can remember, and always believed him to be a perfectly honest, loyal, and well-meaning man; which I do certify.

N. W. HIGINBOTHAM.

Pilltown, 19th August, 1820.

Having an intimate acquaintance with the Rev. Laurence Morrissy for a length of time, I can fully certify his character to be unimpeachable, during the period of my acquaintance with him. Given under my hand at Oning, this 19th day of August, 1820.

THOMAS BOWERS.

I have always entertained the highest opinion of Mr. Morrissy's character, both private and professional.

EDWARD BRISCOE.

*Garnarea, Carrick-on-Suir,
21st August, 1820.*

From the respectability of the signatures attached to the above statements of the Rev.

Mr. Morrissey's moral and loyal character, I have no hesitation in asserting, that I believe the whole to be perfectly correct. Given under my hand at Tinvane, this 24th day of August, 1820.

HENRY BRISCOE, Justice of Quorum.

I certify that, both from report and my own knowledge of the Rev. Laurence Morrissey, during his residence in the parish of Oning and Templeorum, I knew him to be strictly correct, and remarkably attentive to the moral education of the children of his parishioners. Given under my hand, at the Three Bridges, this 24th day of August, 1820.

E. W. BRISCOE.

From my long knowledge of the above named Mr. Morrissey, I believe the above statements to be correct and just.

CHRISTOPHER BLUNDEN.

Fidown, 2d September, 1820.

I have known the Rev. Mr. Morrissey these many years, and always considered him a well conducted proper man; and I think the treatment he has received from the head of his church, is a great hardship.

T. H. BLUNDEN.

2d September, 1820.

From my own knowledge of the Rev. Mr. Morrissey, and the united opinion of all his parish, in which he has lived for many years, I know him to be an honest, good, and exemplary character.

RICHARD ELLIOTT.

Clonmore, 2d September, 1820.

I perfectly coincide with the above statement, knowing it to be correct and true.

ROBERT ELLIOTT.

Clonmore, 2d September, 1820.

I have known the Rev. Laurence Morrissy above mentioned, for many years, and always considered him perfectly correct, and always very much respected by his friends and acquaintances.

JOSEPH BARKER, Surgeon.

Carrick-on-Suir, 21st September, 1820.

I certify that I have known the Rev. Laurence Morrissy, since the first day he came into the parishes of Oning and Templeorum, and always greatly esteemed his character as a Parish Priest, and not only from several reports, but from repeated opportunities of meeting him; and his principles were peaceable, loyal, and truly moral, and his object was to instil such principles into his flock.


ROBERT SHAW,

3d November, 1820.

Vicar of St. John's, Kilkenny.

There was a combination formed between Priests and Superiors, to alienate the minds of the flock from the subordination due to the Pastor—to corrupt their morals, by withdrawing from them the divine sacraments—by preventing the shepherd of their souls from preaching to them the word of eternal life—to suppress the practice of morality on the sabbath-day, by closing up the places of divine worship against the faithful: for which reason mal-practices and dissipation of life were substituted, and then—to rouse them up to every degree of hatred

and animosity against me, by insinuating to, and convincing them that I was the sole cause of all these deplorable misfortunes, and spiritual privations; and finally—for the express purpose of representing me at home and abroad, as a clergyman unworthy of the *cure* of souls and government of the people, by whom I was so much despised and abominated, These and many other indescribable projects were the previous preparations adopted for the dispossession and destruction of the parish priest of Oning and Templeorum. The adoption of such measures is considered necessary in this country, in order to conceal the scheme and support the system—a system devised in hell by the common enemy of mankind, for the damnation of souls—a system taught and practised on earth by his *disciples* with greater zeal and physical force than *the HOLY SCRIPTURES, DIVINELY REVEALED FOR THE SALVATION OF MAN, although they announce and profess themselves the true Ministers of Jesus Christ!!!* Notwithstanding all the stratagems used, they got but few, comparatively speaking, among my flock to answer their purpose; and some of that description would be found in every man's parish throughout Ireland, who discharges his duty as a *zealous Pastor* ought, and proves faithful to his *King and Country*.

2d. Charge—*Ipse, &c.* “He, Mr. Morrissey, without any provocation, received the Bishop, on his visitation in Oning, contumaciously, and—as one of the common plebeians, and resisted him

 face to face, to the great scandal of all present.”

Refutation.—I have sufficiently proved before,

without any manner of dubitation, that I was unwarrantably provoked and imperiously called upon in defence of my moral character, for the sake of religion, and the edification of the people, to make a candid declaration of my innocence and protest against the insidious attack the bishop had made on my fame and honour, without any provocation or least necessity, but to gratify his revengeful inclination, and extort some pretext for proceeding against the object of his wrath. Instead of receiving him with contumacy, &c. as he says, I paid him more honour and respect than I was truly bound to do; I left my chapel to meet him on his arrival—I made a genuflection to him before the people: But, by his own declaration, that did not suffice, as I did not *prostrate* myself in the gutter, and make genuflections as often as I should approach him or pass him by, and humbly bow at every word and nod of his head, according to the vulgar custom of priests and laity in Ireland: a custom not practised in other countries; no, not even in Rome. I was one day taking a walk to Porta Pia in that city, with a gentleman of great respectability, and high situation in the State: We met one of the Cardinals, who was an Archbishop, on our way; I made a genuflection thro' respect to the Cardinal; this gentleman with whom I was walking, asked me was that our custom in Ireland; I informed him, it was, and that the contrary custom, or an inculpable omission, would be considered a serious crime, as was to be seen in the charges preferred against me; he laughed, and said that, that was not their custom in Rome, and that they do not

make a genuflection to any man except to the Pope alone, their temporal Prince and head of their church, and begged that I should not expose myself to the laughter and ridicule of any man in future. I found this to be the case afterwards by experience. If I did insult his Lordship so ignominiously, and receive him so contemptuously as he declares, is it likely he would dine with me, in my own house, the following day? does it consist with reason? The *omnipotent Prelate* scandalized me publicly on Sunday the 18th of June, 1815, dined with me cheerfully on the Monday following, and suspended me without mercy, on the Tuesday after, and left the parish in a worse state than he found it—left it without a Pastor, without a spiritual Guide, exposed to ravenous wolves and mercenary hirelings, who devoured the lambs and fleeced the sheep.—The Prelate complains that I resisted him face to face—had I done so, at that critical moment, I am persuaded, I would act with the same spirit that St. Paul did, when he *resisted St. Peter face to face*, (Gal. chap. ii. ver. 11.) though being his superior.

3d. Charge—Jussus, &c. “Being commanded to repair in some measure this great scandal on the following Sunday, by acknowledging his fault and asking pardon, he publicly violated and despised these commands.”

Refutation.—The Bishop, indeed, ordered me to do what he himself is strictly bound to do, according to the opinion of the best divines, viz. to repair the scandal he had given in the chapel of Oning, by coming there with a spirit

of hostility to defame a man of a good character before the public.

2dly—For the scandal he had given by conniving at the unpardonable conduct of his Vicar and Clergy, who deprived the faithful, without a cause, of all the sacraments and sacrifices instituted by Jesus Christ himself; for conniving at the scandalous conduct of some dissipated Priests; for conniving at the sinful and censorious conduct of those clergy and laity, who nailed up Chapels, broke houses, secreted the parish vestments, prevented stations for conferring sacraments, and deluged the parish with vice and disorder. Not a word from the Prelate against the perpetrators of these outrages committed against the law of God, and of the country, against religion and society; but directed all his virulence and vituperation against the man, who endeavored to prevent all these misfortunes: The Doctor ends this charge by saying “that I violated his commands publicly.” Indeed he might maintain, with some degree of propriety, that I violated them privately; for he gave me private orders only in writing, to make his commands public, with which I did not comply, as being intolerant, degrading and oppressive; therefore the violation alluded to was rather private than public; but his narrative rather culpable than correct.

4th. Charge—*Idcirco*, &c. “For this reason he was suspended for a time, and strictly prohibited from the exercise of clerical functions, until he would declare his fault to his Bishop, at least privately; notwithstanding, he frequently said Mass and administered

sacraments in private houses, and in the Chapel publicly."

Refutation.—I was suspended for three months only; this suspension contained an intolerable condition, a violation of the laws of God and rights of man, uncanonical prohibitions and glaring injustice; and for these reasons the suspension was invalid, and, according to the sacred canons, could be despised and contemned: still, for peace sake, I kept it inviolate for the three months specified; and afterwards resumed my *Pastoral functions*, which I was bound in conscience to do. But previous to this re-assumption, I made every effort, both public and private, to be reconciled to my Bishop, who was inexorable, and notwithstanding all my humble efforts, had the hardihood and unlimited conscience to inform the Court of Rome, that he would receive even privately, any proper acknowledgement or becoming submission. In Roman Catholic Countries, where there are Churches in every town and country village, the Clergy are prohibited to celebrate Mass or confer Sacraments any where except in the Church, unless in case of necessity. But in this country, through necessity, and for cogent reasons, we are allowed to officiate and administer sacraments in houses, and even in the open fields, as is the custom still in some parts of Ireland. Now what is justly allowed and practised here would be a crime there, punishable by censures, &c. and therefore the Doctor (thinking that in Rome, they were ignorant of this custom and toleration in

Ireland) informed them that I was guilty of a breach of the discipline of the Church, by officiating in private houses. Ah! what can this dissimulation be called? meanness of principle, or propense malice? Shall I further declare that the Prelate adds a *palpable untruth* to an unjustifiable charge, by certifying that I frequently celebrated mass, &c. in the Chapel, whereas I never did but once since the unlawful suspension was inflicted: for his faithful Agents in the Parish prevented that Pastoral right, by locking and nailing up the Chapels against me.

5th Charge—Innumeros, &c. “He (Mr. Morrissey) applied to innumerable Anti-Catholic Lawyers and procurators, and left nothing, undone that could be effected by art or money, to commence a lawsuit against his Bishop in a civil court, under this pretext, that his Bishop, by ecclesiastical censures, injured his character and temporal property.”

Refutation.—In the beginning of this charge, the Prelate bellows out his usual exaggerations and wanton extravagances, by saying that I consulted innumerable anti-catholic Lawyers, &c. I do not deny, but I had consulted a Lawyer; who professes himself a member of the *Established Church*: I did not consider this consultation, held with a *Protestant Barrister*, a crime; neither do I still, or ever shall be convinced of such erroneous doctrine—I confess, I have consulted when I was overwhelmed with inquisitorial censures—deprived of my property by *force* and *tyranny*—injured in my character without trial or convic-

tion—immersed in miseries and unrelenting persecutions—and when I could not find mercy, or obtain justice in the Roman Catholic Church of Ireland.

If Dr. MARUM was deprived of his Diocess, and of every necessary means for the support of his temporal existence, and spiritual welfare by his spiritual superiors, what would he not do? If he was inquisitorially treated by them as I was by him, would he then have recourse to his spurious canons in support of the iniquitous inquisition, by which he tried and condemned me? Let him strike his breast and declare the truth. We find Bishops to be the most tenacious and most jealous of their rights and prerogatives; and still the most adverse to those who support the same privilege. If any of those *blustering Roman Catholic Lawyers*, who vociferate at public meetings and in private company against the appointment made by the *Grand Jury of Dublin*, to the Roman Catholic Chaplaincy of Newgate, were suspended by their spiritual superiors, from their office, deprived of their property, and prevented from acting in their legal capacity to support their family and maintain independence, would they suffer all with impunity? or would they seek redress and take legal proceedings? Let them (like honest men) declare their sentiments, and allow others the privilege they claim themselves. May I never see *the day* that an *aspiring Lawyer* may be crowned the *Monarch of Ireland*, or even be made the *Petty Prince of an Irish Province!!!* All the enemies

of a *Protestant Government*, raised their hands and voices against me, for applying to a *Protestant Barrister*, in support of my right, against my ecclesiastical superiors.

St. Leo, the great, applied to the Emperor Augustus, to interpose his power against the nefarious abuses of ecclesiastical superiors. St. Paul appealed to Cæsar on spiritual and ecclesiastical affairs: What religion had Cæsar? The learned Salgado, Rebuffus and many others, are of opinion, that spiritual superiors acting tyrannically against the sacred canons, could be prosecuted publicly, even *by the Julian Law*; if so, why not by the *just Laws of England*? A Clergyman in France, Germany, Tuscany, and many other countries, can legally proceed against his spiritual superiors in cases of injustice and ecclesiastical censures. The **BRITISH** Laws are considered by all, as good and just as the laws of these, or any other country. Therefore, why does not the Church at present allow a man to have recourse to the laws of this country, on similar occasions, as she does in other countries, or as she did when these countries were Roman Catholic? The reasons are quite obvious, and require no explanation.

6th Charge.—*Appellationem*, &c. “He (Mr. Morrissey) made an appeal to a *Protestant Official* of a Metropolitan *Protestant Court*, and implored his assistance, in a mere Ecclesiastical matter, against his Bishop; of which Dr. TROY, among others was witness.”

Refutation.—I never made an appeal on this occasion, to any man of any persuasion what-

soever, except to a Roman Catholic Prelate; consequently Dr. TROY, or any other man could not witness what never existed; if he can, let him come forward and substantiate the charge. At this and the preceding charge, the Cardinal Prefect, Fontana, shook his head three different times, (as I have remarked before) in such a notable manner, as anticipated the sentence that followed.

7th Charge—Cum, &c. “When, by iniquitous machinations, he could do nothing for a whole year, he at length appealed to the *Archbishop of Dublin*, but did not appear on the day appointed, knowing very well that he had nothing to advance in his own justification, and that he dare not offer his false, feigned, and artful documents in this place, where their malignity would be easily discovered; but he had every hope that they might prevail in a foreign place.”

Refutation.—I am really ashamed to be obliged to prove, that my Bishop, throughout all his accusations, is guilty of what would raise a blush in the most abject Plebeian, viz. of *telling so many untruths and downright falsehoods*. He has impelled me to make this declaration—he has outstepped common decency—he has disgraced the episcopal dignity by such subtle inventions:—in place of being twelve months, as the Prelate says, without making an appeal to the Metropolitan, Dr. Troy, I made an early appeal to him, when I was first persecuted by Dr. Mansfield, the Vicar Capitular. The very first Monday after he (Dr. M.) suspended me, I came to

Dublin, and applied to Dr. Troy for justice; and afterwards to Dr. O'Reilly of Drogheda, *the Metropolitan of all Ireland*. Dr. Troy is still alive, can he deny the fact? Nevertheless, see what Dr. Marum says in the commencement of this accusation, and how evident it is, that he himself was guilty of what he charges me with, viz. that he dare not bring forward his inquisitorial, fictitious, and artful accusations before any just and impartial tribunal, where their malicious invention, dangerous tendency, and direful effects would be discovered, discussed, and handed down to public notice, and public animadversion; and for that reason established, in his own house, an iniquitous sacerdotal forum, in order to stem justice and exclude equity, to conceal perfidy and support tyranny. I was by artifices and stratagems, prevented from appearing at the mock trial the day he alludes to in his accusation, and makes my non-attendance, thus contrived, a serious charge against me, in a foreign court, where he never thought, I would have any personal recourse to, in order to discover the treachery and fallacy of these accusations.

8th Charge—"He, Mr. Morrissey, never received a canonical collation of the Parish of Oning and Templeorum; never possessed it peaceably as Parish Priest; but, although he had the administration of it for several years, in consequence of the infirmity of the Pastor, he was notwithstanding considered by his Bishop a Vicar moveable at will."

Refutation.—The Bishops of Ireland, supported by the Court of Propaganda de Fide,

infringed on the ancient and true law of the Church, and substituted a simoniacal system of their own to deprive the Pastor of his ecclesiastical right, the Layman of his spiritual consolation, and both of that paternal and filial happiness, blessing and harmony which would otherwise mutually exist between them, and ultimately contribute towards the peace and tranquillity of church and state. They give no canonical collations except by way of deception and in an uncanonical manner and form; and will afterwards make this infringement and usurpation a cause of expulsion whenever it suits their own purpose, and strenghtens their views. Without any canonical collation in form, Dr. Lanigan's letters to me, on the internal and external government of my Parish, the appointment of coadjutors for several years, long possession after the resignation and death of my predecessor, the dominion and use of all the parochial emoluments to which no man is entitled to, or can enjoy, but a Parish Priest; and above all the constitutions of the apostolic court of equity, would put my right and title beyond all manner of doubt and dispute, had I not been charged with the crime of *heresy*. It is well known by Dr. Marum, that I enjoyed a peaceable possession of this parish for many years under Dr. Lanigan, his predecessor, and perhaps, as equally well known to him, that a certain Priest was quite jealous for seeing me in full and peaceable possession of a rich living, when he himself was without any for years. I could ardently wish that the secrets of some

hearts might be revealed for the moment!!! My Predecessor, the Rev. James Lalor, died the third day of June, 1811. But, from the above statement of Dr. Marum, we are to understand that he never resigned his Parish, at least, up to the year 1819, in which this business was uncanonically decided; that he did not die before that year, or perhaps since, (although I attended his funeral obsequies eight years before)—that I was only his vicar or curate, in consequence of the state of infirmity he was in, and is at present, as far as others might know. Shall I expose the man, and shew the world, that no credit can be attached to his word, no veracity found in his assertions, no integrity in his reports!!! (See his misrepresentations!!)—his calumny on his predecessor, Dr. Lanigan, &c. a Prelate who excelled others in learning, wisdom and piety, as much as they excelled him in *ignorance, malice and impiety.*

Three years peaceable possession with a coloured title ensures his living to the possessor. “*Rig. Canc. Apost.*” Thirteen years possession without any canonical appointment, induction, collation or any other title whatsoever, constitutes the Pastoral jurisdiction of a Parish Priest, and establishes the ecclesiastical right of a Beneficiary to hold, possess and enjoy his living during life, with all the fruits and emoluments accruing from it. Besides several documents from my former Bishop, together with many other circumstances, would sufficiently prove the title and collation required by the canon law, where the Council of Trent is

not received. Still, in contradiction to all these ecclesiastical laws, he does not hesitate to assert, "that I have no collation, no tie or right to my Parish." Dr. Lanigan was bound in conscience and under the penalty of sin, to appoint a Parish Priest to Oning and Templeorum, before the expiration of six months after the resignation of my Predecessor, the Rev. Mr. Lalor, or, at least, in the course of six months after his death; and in default of the Ordinary, the Archbishop of the Province, Dr. Troy; in case of omission on his part—the Primate of all Ireland, Dr. O'Reilly—and in default of all, the Pope of Rome. This is the law of the Church, binding all concerned *sub gravi* under a grievous sin, in such a case of great moment and serious consequence, as the canonical appointment of a Pastor to preside over the flock must be. All the above Prelates, were informed of the resignation and death of my Predecessor, and of my appointment and long possession in said Parish, and not one of them ever attempted to appoint to this living, because they knew that my right and title were good, otherwise they would be bound, in succession, under sin, to make the necessary appointment. If this is not the case, there is no use in making the law, or no sin in breaking it. Notwithstanding Dr. Marum by his conduct, my dispossession, and subsequent appointment, would feign shew the world that his superiors acted contrary to the sacred canons, and of course were guilty of a grievous sin, for not appointing in their turn, a Pastor to Oning and Templeorum; and now arrogates to him-

self the power and right of appointment to this Parish, which devolved on his superiors in case of the default of Dr. Lanigan (which is not to be admitted) and consequently by every appointment he made or will make to said living during my life, he violates the canons and stands guilty in the sight of God.

9th Charge—Oblatam sibi, &c.—"He pertinaciously refused the pension offered him by his Bishop; conformably to the admonition of the sacred congregation."

Refutation.—I declare most solemnly that my Bishop never offered me a pension; and also, that I never made application for any, as nothing could in justice satisfy me, or repair the injury done, but an absolute reinstatement in my living, and full restitution of what was monopolized and unjustly taken away. My Bishop made no mention of his having pertinaciously refused to comply with the orders of his superiors, when commanded to reinstate me. If he did make the offer alluded to, let him step forward and prove it by proper witness:—The word or the oath of an officer of the holy Inquisition could not be relied upon, or taken for granted, for several reasons.

10th Charge—"He is so stubborn, headstrong, proud and obstinate—that it is against the Bishop's conscience to give him the care of souls, and justly dreads that he would be rejected by all."

Refutation.—Indeed, had I been Dr. Marum, I would prefer leaving this mode of scolding and brawling to coal-porters and fish-women, and speak like a gentleman, or a man of com-

mon politeness. Why did not the Prelate give his *conscience* the same *latitude* here, he gave it when he told me, that a bishop could suspend a parish priest for ever without assigning any reason, if he only thought in his mind that he was right in doing so ; or rather why did he not confine the dictates of his conscience within the limits of justice and pathos of religion, before he allowed the operations of an erroneous one to blight the qualifications St. Paul requires in a bishop ? I do sincerely lament that the conscience of many bishops will allow them to promote the ignorant and the libertine ; while they exclude the intelligent and virtuous priest from the holy ministry. I am an ocular witness to many examples of this nature. Experience is become a general proof. When my reinstatement to some parish was ordered by Rome, there was then a spirit of refusal and opposition engendered by the Prelate and his agents, throughout the diocese, in order to prejudice the people against my reception, by foul insinuations ; and when this spirit of resistance was brought to maturity, he makes it a cause of complaint, and perpetual expulsion in the court of Rome.

11th Charge—"The bishop tried all the means in his power to reform and reconcile the inflexible priest ; and was always willing with all his heart, in the best manner possible to consult his interest and welfare, provided he shewed any signs, even privately, of amendment and humility, but all in vain."

Refutation.—I am surprized that Dr. Marum is not ashamed to make those declarations, which are flatly contradicted by his cruel treat-

ment towards me. He deprived me of all I possessed in this world; and I ask, was this the way to consult my interest, or effect a reconciliation? by no means: But on the contrary he has used all the means in his power to make me apostatize, change my religion, and become a DEIST, like our *Ecclesiastical Inquisitors*.

I need not endeavour to impress the veracity of my assertions on the minds of those, who were ocular witnesses, to the living examples practiced in Oning and Templeorum, in the County of Kilkenny—or on the minds of those who are enlightened and read with impartiality the documents contained in the first part of my work. I often solicited, both publicly and privately, a reconciliation on satisfactory and honourable terms, with my Bishop, but in vain.—Nothing could prevail—except I would abjure the principles of morality and truths of religion, and become a faithful Member of the *holy* Inquisition.

12th Charge—“Mr. Morrissy did not act as he ought in the parish, and therefore rendered himself obnoxious to his parishioners; who shut the parish chapel against him, and interdicted him from officiating, and would not any longer pay him his parochial dues.”

Refutation.—In order to accomplish my destruction, and have some pretext for expulsion, my superiors and their clerical agents excited and encouraged my parishioners to rebel against, and oppose me; they used all the means and stratagems possible to render me odious in my parish. They loaded me with public and private censures, and then represented me as a

disgraced clergyman, and of course a disgrace to my parish to have such a pastor preside over them. I had three chapels in my parish, and my spiritual superiors were the first and last who closed them against me.

First—The chapel of Piltown was closed up by the Vicar Capitular, Doctor Mansfield, who repeatedly gave me positive orders in writing, not to celebrate mass, administer sacraments, or instruct the faithful there under pain of suspension. (See his letters and censures in 1st part)—The same vicar also closed the parish chapel of Templeorum against me by prohibiting divine service there under pain of suspension ; and at the same time foisted into my parish another priest, who under his jurisdiction aided by a few of the parishioners encouraged for that purpose, nailed up said chapel against me.

2nd—Doctor Marum closed the same Parish Chapel against me afterwards, by giving me positive orders, in the presence of the Rev. Mr. Carrol, not to celebrate Mass there, until the trial he proposed should be held in Kilkenny. Had he desired me to say mass and officiate in my Parish Chapel until the said trial would take place, and until I would be found guilty, or acquitted by fair investigation and an impartial jury, it would consist of both reason and religion ; but by this prohibition, he condemned me in the face of the public before I was tried, and punished me before I was convicted. Afterwards my Curate, (who was one of Dr. Marum's Agents in the Parish) closed and locked up my other Parish Chapel of Oning, and secreted the Parish Vestments, in order that I should not celebrate or officiate there

for my people. Dr. Marum came to my Parish, and subreptitiously foisted into my living the Rev. Mr. Cody, and gave strict orders to my Parishioners to pay the parochial dues to him alone. Had not the people complied they would be censured and punished. What treatment can be compared to this? Witness, to all these transactions, their own letters, their accomplices, the clergy and the entire Parish of Oning and Templeorum. The perpetrators were guilty of the following censures and capital crimes:—

1st—They have contaminated the sanctuary and subverted the laws.

2nd—They have incurred an excommunication, by shutting up places of divine worship. *Con. Trid.*

3d—They have committed a capital crime by violating the law of the land, which prohibits under pain of death, to close or fasten any place of divine worship against any clergyman.—*White Boy Act.*

4th—They have been guilty of giving great scandal, and injuring religion in a notable manner.

5th—They have been guilty of great injustice, by depriving the people of the sacraments, and sacrifices, to which they had a divine and ecclesiastical right; the Parish Priest of his clerical and pastoral functions, and temporal emoluments.

6th—Although the Prelates and their Clergy, were the principle Agents in the perpetration of the above outrages, yet the Bishop represents the Parishioners (in Rome) as being the culprits when he says, “they

abominated their Pastor, closed the Chapels against him and would not pay his Parochial Dues.”—invidious misrepresentations. (See their testimonials in favour of the Pastor.) In as much as individuals were guilty, the Clergy and their Superiors, were the ring-leaders.—I venture to say, and am fully convinced, that there is no Parish in Ireland, but there would be some persons found to rise in open rebellion against their Pastor, and cause disturbance and much confusion, if they were stimulated and encouraged by the Clergy and Prelates of the Diocess, as they were in Templeorum. I have often seen and heard, in many parts of Ireland, Chapels closed and nailed up against Parish Priests, by their respective flocks; but never saw or heard that the perpetrators were Priests and Prelates, except in Oning and Templeorum: But on the contrary, I always saw and learned that such insubordinate and rebellious dispositions and attempts, were always checked and counteracted by the immediate interference of the Bishop of the respective Diocess, and that they would not be gratified in turning away the Pastor, and substituting a man of their own choice; for if such irreligious practices and prevailing examples were sanctioned and encouraged, what would be the state of our Church and condition of our religion in Ireland? What would be the morals of the people and state of the country?

13th Accusation.—“The major part of the Parishioners entreated the Bishop to remove him; therefore the Pastor should be removed when the flock run away from him.”

Refutation.—The above answer to the last charge will sufficiently refute this infamous assertion and foul calumny of the desertion of the major part of my flock, whereas none can be found in one of the two Parishes, I held, (Oning) who had deserted me or run away from my pastoral administration; and in the other Parish, (Templeorum) there were but few, comparatively speaking, who opposed me at any time; and these very few were influenced by the Clergy and encouraged by the Vicar and Bishop, to co-operate with them in the accomplishment of my destruction, and after making these dupes the instruments of their private views and temporal interest, the Bishop deceitfully charges themselves (and some thousands besides) in Rome, with being guilty of great and infamous crimes, and capital transgressions against the laws of their country, viz. to despise the Pastor of their souls and run away from him, to deprive their Parish Priest of his lawful dues and refuse paying him the means of his temporal support, and to nail up the public places of divine worship against him, and of course against the faithful.—The testimonials of my Parishioners will confront the malignity of this report better than any private remarks, though ever so convincing.

14th Charge.—“When the Rev. Mr. Knaw, was appointed Parish Priest in Mr. Morrissey’s place by the Right Rev. Dr. Lanigan, he (Mr. Morrissey) opposed this appointment, fought with Mr. Knaw, and turned him by force out of the Parish, before the people.”

Refutation—Doctor Lanigan never intimated to me that he would make any change, or send any other clergyman in my place to Oning or Templeorum. I never saw Mr. Knaw in my parish, I never spoke to him on the subject; of course I could not fight with him or turn him out of my parish. Mr. Knaw, I am sure, will be candid enough to refute this calumnious imputation, if ever called upon the occasion. My parishioners, who, the bishop says, were eye witness to this transgression, can testify the non-existence of said transaction.

15th Accusation—"At a meeting of the priests on some spiritual or ecclesiastical occasion, Mr. Morriasy wishing to take his seat among the parish priests, was told by one of them, that he was not entitled to that privilege, as he was not a parish priest."

Refutation—I never recollect such a circumstance to happen; I always saw the parish priests and coadjutors sitting indiscriminately together at all meetings, except in one instance, viz. When Dr. Lanigan exempted the parish priests from answering theological questions at conferences, they took their seats at the bishop's right hand, and the coadjutors at his left hand: I took my seat as parish priest among the pastors, and enjoyed the same privilege and the same exemption they did on that, and every other occasion during my incumbency in the diocess.

These are the charges preferred against me in the Court of Rome by my bishop.

Are not these charges replete with every thing except justice and honesty? Are they not pregnant with every thing except mercy

and charity? Are they not fertile with every thing except principle and honour? Is there one of them exempt from untruths, misrepresentations and calumnies? These charges, together with their respective refutations; the cases of both parties and the documents of various transactions, for several years, were at length laid before the particular deputation. Now there was a question of questions, a business of great magnitude, involving in its bosom the law of God and man, the law of the church and state, the character of clergy and laity, the salvation of souls, and scandal of thousands, the persecution of the shepherd and injury of the flock, the spoliation of the Pastor and monopoly of the Prelate, together with a train of innumerable and irreparable evils, emanating from episcopal usurpation and vicarial tyranny, and tending to ecclesiastical anarchy and destruction of religion, to be finally adjusted and put to rest for ever more, by a select number of Cardinals, who composed the particular congregation. In the interim, I went in company with my advocate and some other friends of respectability, to these Cardinals and their Auditors, and treated with them on the subject in question, who gave every flattering encouragement. One Cardinal said, that Dr. Marum himself gave the scandal he so vehemently exclaimed against: Another declared "that the principal difficulty in deciding in my favour was, that at a meeting of the Clergy, a Parish Priest said, I could not sit among themselves, as I was not a Pastor." The third confessed, that Doctor Marum's charges did

not avail, because they were not authenticated, and because they proved nothing. But the Inquisition requires no solid or convincing proofs in cases of *heresy*; for a mere suspicion is sufficient for taking proceedings, for deciding and condemning without trial or conviction.— Previous to the pretended investigation, a report was prevalent among the friends of the inhuman system, that my case would be discarded, and that I would be condemned, because a certain charge (application to heretics, &c.) was advanced against me by my bishop, and corroborated by my arch-bishop, Doctor Troy. A similar declaration fell from the lips of Doctor Marum's agent there, which was communicated to me by a certain dignitary of the church. It appears now that I was condemned at home and abroad before I was tried. This is the usual mode adopted by the judges and officers of our Inquisitorial Courts all over the world. At length the time of trial and investigation arrived; the long and various appeals with the summaries annexed, the different charges preferred on both sides, the intrigues, injustices and persecutions of several years, swelled the briefs to so great a bulk and vital interest, as to put it beyond the power of any court of judicature in Europe, to decide the case pending with justice and equity perhaps in one day, nay, in several days or perhaps weeks— Notwithstanding this business of such magnitude and great importance, was daubed over in a few minutes. The place appointed for the decision of this cause was a private house in Strado Conducto; no prosecutor, no advocate, no council admitted.

The Court was composed of three Judges without a jury, and a secretary to take down the decision given. The judges were sworn to support the Inquisition, and decide according to the tenets therein contained. I was in an adjacent house, but dare not appear, watching their arrival, the time spent, and their departure thence. To the best of my knowledge they remained together on this important occasion, only from twenty minutes to half an hour. The reading of the documents alone would probably take up three or four hours. I was informed that they never read them or heard them read; as the usual mode in critical and elaborate cases is, to hand them over to private individuals, to take their report and decide accordingly: The one charge was sufficient for their eminences to read or hear of from others—"heresy."

What could delay the judges, where briefs were not to be read; no questions to be asked—no examinations to take place—no Lawyer to plead the cause—nothing but a dead silence, in order to give a mortal blow?

I am not surprised, the English should be scandalized at such proceedings, the French should condemn such laws, the Italians despise such principles, and the Romans should wish for a temporal Prince and change of Government. But let us attend to the sentence passed by the three wise sages of the West.

"In congregatione particulari de Propaganda Fide a Sanctissimo D. N. deputata in causa Appellationis R. D. Laurentii Morrissy, contra R. P. D. Kyranum Marum Episcopum Ossoriensem in Hibernia habita die 17 Novembris, 1819.

Eminentissimi P. P. decreverunt, Episcopum Ossoriensem recte se gessisse, Presbyteram vero Morrissy male Appellasse, eumque arcendum esse ab institutione cujusvis Beneficii habentis curam animarum donec resipiscat; et ad D. Secretarium cum Sanctissimo juxta mentem. Mens est, supplicandum esse Sanctissimo, ut ex aliarum Paræciarum redditibus occasione vacationis ex gratia eidem Presbytero, quatenus de vera ipsius inopia Episcopo constat, assignetur annua pensio trigenta librarum sterlinarum Hiberniarum ad vitæ sustentationem, et ad Ossoriensem Episcopum pro executione."

Translation.—"In a particular congregation of Propaganda de Fide, deputed by his Holiness, in the cause of the appeal of the Rev. Laurence Morrissy against the Rt. Rev. Doctor Marum, Bishop of Ossory in Ireland, held the 17th day of November, 1819, their Eminences have decreed; that the bishop of Ossory had acted right; and that the priest, Morrissy, had acted wrong in appealing against him, and that he is not to get any benefice with the care of souls annexed to it, until he reforms. It is also decreed, that his Holiness is to be requested, to order an annual pension of £30. to be paid out of the emoluments of other parishes, according as they become vacant, for the same priest, if it will appear to his bishop that he shall be in real want."

This sentence was given to my procurator by one of the Secretaries of Propaganda, Galliazzì. It was not given in form; the resolution was not signed by the relator; it does not appear that the Pope gave his assent, as was necessary

on this occasion—it is not a genuine document—it is deficient—it does not bind. I got a legal opinion to this effect in Rome.

In the first instance it was not the Pope deputed this congregation, but the Cardinal Prefect by the Pope's desire—the said inquisitorial congregation exactly decided this long procrastinated business, conformably to the laws now established by the Court de PROPAGANDA TYRANNIDE, USURPATIONE, INJUSTITIA. A COURT, IN OUR DAYS, CALCULATED TO PROPAGATE TYRANNY USURPATION AND INJUSTICE. * * * *

In the opinion of this Court Dr. Marum had acted right, because he observed and executed their inquisitorial laws and supported their sanguinary measures. But in the estimation of all other courts of conscience, and real equity, he violated the laws of God and man: and in the opinion of Apostolic men and enlightened Divines, he incurred many censures and heavy obligations. According to the sentence given above, I acted wrong for not coinciding in opinion and acting in practise with my superiors in the extermination of heresy. I acted wrong in making application to those upright men, for whom they entertain a mortal hatred, and would destroy, if possible: and for these reasons, their Eminences took particular care that I should be deprived of the best means a Priest could have, to enlighten the people, to preach against errors, to inculcate submission to the laws and obedience to ruling powers, viz. "*Cura*

Animarum”—“*The care of souls.*” They were fully aware that this situation would afford a faithful man every favourable opportunity of supplanting inquisitorial systems, and substituting loyal principles. These are the measures the laws of their court prescribe.

Indeed the Cardinals make mention of Thirty Pounds per annum; but they manage the business, so as that I could never be paid this pittance. Oh! horrid contrivance to starve a man to death!!! as he cannot be burned by the faggot, or nailed up to the wall in subterraneous caverns under the feet of Inquisitorial Monks and Friars. In the first place, this trifling sum, no way adequate to my support, would not be given until I would reform and become a member of the inquisitorial phalanx. Secondly, if it did not appear to my Bishop that I was in extreme distress, whether he might judge right or wrong, he need not pay the miserable pension. And thirdly, to exclude the possibility of being paid the same and obtaining any support, the said small sum was to be apportioned on the Parishes throughout the Diocess, according as the Pastors would die, and the benefices become vacant. Now, according to this newly devised plan, any sum could be levied on the first vacant parish: for example, a pound or a guinea, and in proportion, until as many parishes would become vacant as should suffice to pay the sum total. (£30) By this scheme all the Parish Priests in the diocess of Ossory *should die first,** and I should survive all, before

* There are but twenty-eight or twenty-nine Parishes in the Diocess.

this sum could be annually paid. However, as I am fond of living long, I would be tempted to agree to the contract if their *omnipotence* would ensure that longevity!!!

At length as the judges of the ecclesiastical court closed the doors of mercy and avenues of justice against me, I had no other alternative, but to think, (in my melancholy moments) of returning to my native soil, and get out of the inquisition with the greatest precaution, in silence, without murmuring or complaining of being badly treated. I was much afraid to disclose my mind, or open my lips concerning this horrible tribunal, even to my greatest friends, whereas the least intimation of displeasure or disapprobation would subject me to similar punishments, as I had witnessed myself in Rome, with respect to other Priests, who were taken out of their beds at the dead hour of the night, banished unknown to the world, and no more about them. My fears and alarms were daily increasing until I left the Roman States, in 1820, and arrived in Tuscany.

How happy might I be, if my case was put into the hands of an individual, a Clergyman, or Layman married or unmarried, no matter!! if he gives his opinion and makes his report, for their confirmation, according to his own inclination. For example—There is a case in existence between Priests and Bishops, regulars and superiors, &c. This case is sometimes reciprocally replete with *serious charges* of murder, fornication, adultery, simony, sacrilege, usurpation, injustice, scandal, &c. &c. this case often comprises many sheets, and is

sometimes very complicated. Many cases of this nature, are pouring into the ecclesiastical courts of Rome, especially into Propaganda. The principal ministers and judges of these courts have indeed too much to mind, and little time to spare. Besides attending different festivities throughout the year at different churches, they have to attend occasionally at interments, months' mind, anniversaries, &c. after which it is necessary they should be at home at twelve or one of the clock, to dine, and afterwards to sleep till four or five in the afternoon; then they have to go about in their grand carriages with a great retinue of servants; after returning back, they have often to pay or receive visits, afterwards to sup, and finally, to go to rest for the night. Indeed I must do them this justice, that after all their different avocations, they will go sometimes to Propaganda on Tuesday morning, to settle the ecclesiastical affairs not only of one nation but of all the world; and remain at times, until ten or eleven o'clock in the forenoon, and will sometimes continue for a week to do the same, but seldom longer. Their Eminences thus and more than thus engaged, will very often give such delicate and important cases, (as I have mentioned above) into the hands of an individual, into the hands of a man perhaps prone to the same evils and misfortunes laid before him, and of course inclined to favour what he himself is fond of and addicted to. Whatever conclusion this lay or clerical man will draw, or opinion he forms, the same will be confirmed by those, who intrusted him with the awful res-

ponsibility—by those who give themselves no farther trouble about the merits or demerits of several cases that highly regard the Church of Christ, on earth, and Glory of God in heaven. Such transactions took place in my own time in Rome. But my case was considered of a superior nature, as it contained the crime of heresy ; and therefore should be judged and punished by those, who are bound by oaths to execute the law, whilst at the same time they themselves are not only guilty of the crime they are determined to punish, but of a greater one, Deism ; and thus endeavour to pull the imaginary mote out of their neighbour's eye while the beam rests in their own ; as I shall prove before I finish.

At length I arrived in Dublin, and on the 5th of May, 1820, made application to the Rev. Mr. Kenrick, Curate of Francis-St. for leave to celebrate mass in the parish chapel there, which he politely granted, but in the afternoon of the same day I received the following note from him :—

Rev. and Dr. Sir,—I feel hurt at mentioning to you, what Doctor Hamill said, on my reporting to him, that you wished to celebrate mass in his chapel ; his reply was, that he could allow no priest from any diocess to say mass in Francis-St. chapel, without having previous proof, that all matters stood well at home, between him and his bishop. I am sure this you can do without the smallest difficulty.

I am, Rev. and Dear Sir, your's very truly,
RICHARD KENRICK.

Francis-Street, Friday.

I recollect that fourteen years ago I was, for some time, at Lucan Spa, and was in the habit of coming to town occasionally; I applied then, in like manner, to Mr. Kenrick, who gave the faculties required for celebrating in the same chapel. Dr. Hamill did not then oppose or hinder me to officiate in his chapel, because I was not at the time considered a heretic or anti-inquisitor, as I am now. I had an occasion to speak to Dr. Hamill different times concerning my treatment, and to be candid, he was always of opinion that I was an injured man, that I had a real title to my benefice as Parish Priest, and that I could not (in justice) be disturbed according to the sacred canons. When he was informed that I was an abettor of heresy, and made application to Protestant Gentlemen, denominated anti-catholics, I found him much changed and rather prejudiced, from his conversation with me one night at his own house in Camden-street, and from the subsequent manner in which I was treated. Certainly his situation in the church binds him to support inquisitorial measures.

The cause of my persecutions and spoliations, both at home and abroad, was yet unknown; I therefore inserted the following document in some of the public prints, and afterwards went to the country, to arrange my affairs there, and return again to the City.

“I, the undersigned, consider myself in common justice bound to the popular feelings and friendly anxiety of many, as well as for the self-vindication of traduced innocence and lacerated character, to announce to the public at

at large, the real and exclusive cause of my long protracted and unprecedented persecutions, uncanonical deprivation of an ecclesiastical benefice, suspension of pastoral functions, and clerical duties. The prominent cause alleged is *confirmed Heresy*, insidiously stamped on my character, for which I was tried by a sacerdotal packed jury behind the curtain, unheard and without any evidence in my favour; condemned without the legal process of any *impartial forum*, and unjustly dispossessed without mercy, or commiseration. Such illegal and uncanonical proceedings did not nor ever can deprive me of the ecclesiastical right I have to enjoy the benefice, fruits and emoluments, of the united parishes of Oning and Templeorum, in the diocese of Ossory (after the long possession of fourteen years, in the full enjoyment of all the benefits, jurisdictions, and prerogatives of a parish priest,) until I will voluntarily, and formally, sign and give my resignation of said Parishes. This is the decision of many Popes, and several Councils, besides the decided opinion of able Divines, practical Civilians, and celebrated Canonists, whom I consulted on the subject, both at home and abroad.

I shall at present content myself, by mentioning one only of the charges which subjected me to the painful severity annexed to the crime of *Heresy*:—I retained Edward Pennefather, Esq. as my advocate on a trial promised, but not canonically given—A gentleman of great integrity, rectitude of morals, and scientific assiduity in his professional pursuits, a Lawyer who does much honour to the Irish Bar: also

John Wogan, Esq. of Carrick-on-Suir, as my procurator, who is much esteemed, and justly considered a man of candour, honesty, and competent knowledge in his legal capacity. The retention of such unexceptionable and praiseworthy characters was a *principal charge* preferred against me in the Court of Rome, because they were designated, "Anticatholics", although no Roman Catholic Clergyman, or Roman Catholic Layman would or dare presume to espouse the cause of a *Hetic*, as I am malignantly represented to be: similar punishments, and similar degradation would be their ultimate fate.

I would advise the Episcopal Inquisitors and Arch-Judges not to send this document to the Supreme Tribunal for final condemnation, until they shall have more to swell the library of the Dominican Convent at *Minerva*.

LAURENCE MORRISSY, Parish Priest.

July 17th, 1820.

13, Charlemont-street, Dublin.

Immediately after publishing this document, I went to Waterford, and remained there a few days. On the 21st of July, 1820, I applied there to the Rev. Mr. Connolly, who is the vicar of that district in the absence of his bishop, for permission to say mass, which he granted: I celebrated the following day in the great chapel; and the same day the above document appeared in a very respectable paper, the Waterford Chronicle, and came, for the first time, into the hands of the Vicar. In consequence of this document, I received the following note from him, withdrawing the permission he gave the day before, for the celebration of mass.

Rev. Sir,—In consequence of the letter, which you have inserted in yesterday's paper, I feel it my duty to withdraw from you the permission of saying mass, which I gave you. I do hereby withdraw from you that permission, and regret, that you have put me under the disagreeable necessity of doing so by a publication condemned by every Clergyman.

Yours, &c. G. CONNOLLY, R. C. V. G.

This irreligious, arbitrary and ungentlemanly treatment, I received from Mr. Connolly, together with the condemnation, by all the Clergy, (as he declares) of my public communication, is an undeniable proof of the present existence of the anarchial and unconstitutional system already exploded. I must inform the learned Doctor, that he was guilty of imputing gross ignorance and want of principle to Priests in general, when, he says, "that every Clergyman condemned my letter:" for no Clergyman, who understands the law of the church well, who is an enlightened man and possessed of constitutional principles, would or could, condemn the document alluded to. I conversed with several Clergymen of this description, who were of a contrary opinion with Mr. Connolly. I must act right or wrong in giving publicity to the contents of the letter alluded to. When a man, placed in a public and responsible situation, is accused, condemned, and punished publicly, in the face of the country, the cause, upon which his condemnation and punishment, were grounded, should be made known for the public good, and example of each individual in the com-

munity. When such a man is injured in his character and property, he is strictly bound to vindicate his cause before the public. This publicity is allowed by the law of God and man, religion, and reason—Pope Leo, and St. Francis de Sales, confirm this doctrine. Now Dr. Marum, accused me publicly in the face of three counties, Kilkenny, Tipperary, and Waterford—he degraded, despoiled, and dispossessed me, without a legal or canonical judge or jury. This grievous treatment presupposes a grievous crime, upon which such extraordinary proceedings and extraordinary punishments, were grounded. Notwithstanding, this crime was kept a profound secret; therefore the public had to surmise and conjecture what might be the great crime that deserved the great punishments and privations inflicted; and until this crime or cause, would be made manifest, I should naturally remain suspected and degraded in the public mind and public opinion; and consequently, for the support of my moral character, for the sake of religion and constitutional principles, I was in duty bound to give an unequivocal and candid report of the cause of my degradation, &c. And, indeed, it is for the performance of this public duty, and discharge of this religious obligation, that Mr. CONNOLLY, prevented me from offering up to God the greatest sacrifice that could be offered in Heaven or on earth—the greatest act of adoration that any rational creature could make, and principle duty of a christian Priest, according to the tenets of the Roman Catholic

Church. But whether Mr. CONNOLLY believes these tenets or not—his conduct on this occasion is a proof of his incredibility. Now after proving the right of publicity, must I allow with Dr. CONNOLLY, and the rest of the Clergy (he alludes to in his note) that I acted wrong in making the cause of my persecutions known, as it might actually tend to open the eyes of the Protestants of this country, and ultimately prevent the execution of the general system of banishing *heretics* and confiscating their property, &c. &c.? Such inhuman and disgraceful laws are at present sacrilegiously embodied with the revealed law of true religion and pure christianity; and any man who acts against or discloses the system, for the purpose of prevention, &c. &c. * * acts wrong, is excommunicated, and must be punished by his ecclesiastical superiors. Therefore, according to this present system and universal understanding, Mr. Connolly acted right in prohibiting me from celebrating mass; the Clergymen were just in condemning the document; and of course, I was wrong in giving it publicity.—To conclude, I must acknowledge that the Vicar of Waterford, is a faithful servant, true inquisitor, and zealous supporter of the common cause; and for that reason, deserved to be promoted in the *inquisitorial church of Ireland*.

Now I must step over the River Suir, from one Vicarial, to another Episcopal Minister of the holy office. On the 30th of September, 1820, I requested of the Rev. Mr. Ryan, a

make me acknowledge—1st. That *injustice* is become *justice*—2dly, To declare, that illegal and uncanonical decisions are lawful and binding; and 3rdly, To non-suit all illegal and tyrannical proceedings. On the face of such dishonourable postulations, a thorough conviction of guilt flashes; for, if my superiors acted right, what had they to apprehend, or to be ashamed of?

3rdly, He requires I should never again write on the subject, &c.

The *Doctor of Inquisitorial Laws* inferred from my letter that I would expose the Prelates, Officers and Notaries Apostolic of the Roman Court established in Ireland, by disclosing their solemn oaths and developing their private intrigues against * * *, and therefore promised to barter and grant me the exercise of the spiritual and clerical faculties I received from Jesus Christ, by desisting from the fulfilment of a religious and bounden duty I owe to God and my country, in exposing perfidy, tyranny, and treasonable practices.

The 4th condition is—To express my sorrow for the letter I wrote, &c.

If the contents of this document were not true and well grounded, they could be refuted with more success and plausibility, by some other person, than by the author thus prompted, and thus solicited by promises of the restoration of faculties: But all the Bulls in Rome, Canons of Councils, censures of Prelates, together with deceitful promises, and vain expectations would not excite contrition, or even attrition, in my heart or soul; for telling the truth and nothing else.

5th Condition—I should make the foregoing declarations in writing, or in the presence of witness. Afterwards this acknowledgement and declaration of the above conditions, would be very probably inserted in the public prints, and read from the different altars of the diocess, in order to justify the cruel proceedings of superiors, and exculpate the Bishop of Ossory in the face of the public. By making the declarations required for the obtaining of my faculties, I should become a member of the Ossorian Inquisitorial Society; the next condition would be to take the oath; the third—a co-operation with the system in contemplation.

I shall here quote for the paradigm and imitation of others, the laudable spirit and christian fortitude of an English Bishop, in non-complying with an unwarrantable demand of one of the Roman Pontiffs. Pope Innocent the IV. a Genoese, who was in the habit of giving benefices in England, to his relations in Genoa, commanded Robert, Bishop of Lincoln, a man eminent for learning and strictness of life, to confer a benefice upon a Genoese, against the Canons, which appeared unjust. This Prelate answered, “That he received the Apostolic commands, as they were conformable to the doctrine of the Apostles; but that the non-obstantibus made up of uncertainties, inconsistencies, and proceeding from want of faith, came like a torrent to overthrow the peace of Christendom, &c.—that it was a grievous sin to take away the pasture from the sheep; and that the Apostolic See had all power to edify, but not to destroy. The Bishop would not obey, there-

fore the Pope was enraged"—“*Mandatis Apostolicis, affectione filioli devote et reverenter obedio, his quoque, quæ Mandatis Apostolicis adversantur, paternum zelans honorem, adversor et obsto; ad utrumque enim teneor ex divino mandato—An. 1253—Robertus.*” The Divine and Apostolic commands are both affirmative and negative—We are bound to obey our Superiors, when they command or order us to act according to the doctrine contained in these precepts; and we are equally bound to disobey them, when they command us to act contrary to the said divine commands: And it is upon this principle, I disobeyed my Superiors, when ordered to act in direct opposition to these commands. St. Bernard, writing to Pope Eugene III. laments that Rome was the common rendezvous for the ambitious man, the covetous, the sacrilegious, the adulterer, and the incestuous, resorting there in pursuit of Benefices and preferments. Had I gone to Rome, stamped and charged with these vices, and grievous crimes, in the place of heresy, I would, in all probability, succeed and be reinstated.

In the month of October, 1820, I returned from the Country to Dublin, with all my effects, and with an intention (*animo et corpore*) of making it the place of my perpetual residence, which intention I formed immediately after my return from the continent.

Now I was abandoned by my own church without trial, cause or conviction. I was despised and forsaken by my clerical brethren, because this was the will and pleasure of

dictatorial Bishops. I was deserted by my friends and acquaintances, through besotted infatuation and *blind* obedience to *blind* superiors. The whole world was now shut up against me; Rome left me to the mercy of a *Tyrant*, and sent me back to Ireland, where I could not exercise the spiritual faculties God gave, or comply with the vocation of *Heaven*, in preaching the Gospel, administering the sacraments, &c. For there is a most *unchristian* and unjustifiable law, now established in our church, and embodied with the sacred canons of ancient and holy times. This detestable law goes to annul the divine law, taught by the Apostles, and practised by our holy Fathers; it prevents the liberty of conscience, abrogates divine inspirations and trespasses on the spiritual rights of man. The singular and oppressive law is this. If a Bishop, actuated through spite or malice, sinister motives or self interest; no matter which, suspends, interdicts or excommunicates a Clergyman, he is not to be received or permitted to exercise his clerical faculties, in any part of the world, or instruct the faithful, or infuse spiritual knowledge, or afford any consolation to those who would want and desire his *aid*, until he is highly recommended, and obtains full powers and faculties from his Bishop. In consequence of this mutual understanding, and coercive measure, the Prelates are more irreconcilable and oppressive.

This universal episcopal law is adopted to make Priests submit to ecclesiastical authority in general, (whether holy or despotic) and

support uncanonical constitutions and *inquisitorial* commands wherever the civil authorities do not interpose and restrain such intolerant measures.

Our wise and liberal government, made a statute and fixed a salary for Roman Catholic Clergymen attending his Majesty's Gaols and Bridewells in the united kingdom, and invested the respective Grand Juries of each county, town or city, where the Gaols, &c. are situated, with the power of appointing Chaplains of different persuasions, to fill these responsible and precarious situations. The same prudent and unrivalled government, did not limit the choice and confine the appointment to the Clergy of each individual Parish of said Gaols, against whom the Grand Juries and the government might have sufficient and reasonable objections to promote to ecclesiastical benefices supported by the constitution—not by parochial emoluments. For it is one thing to find an Inquisitor, an adversary and an enemy—and another thing to find a loyal, independent and faithful man. It is one thing to be appointed by a *Roman Catholic Bishop*, and another thing to be appointed by an *English or Irish Grand Jury*. It is one thing to be under the influence of a *Foreign Court*, and another thing to be under the influence of the *Native Court*.

It is well known that the laws, constitutions and principles of the Foreign Court I allude to, are in direct opposition to the laws, lives and interests of the British Government, and of course, that all those who depend on, and are under the influence of that court must neces-

varily be guided and actuated by the same principles it dictates and requires: consequently a Clergyman thus situated, &c. thus influenced, shall guide and instruct those under his charge according to the rules and commands of said church or court, and therefore such a man is not qualified or eligible to instruct, &c. the Prisoners of his Majesty's Gaols, &c. in this country.

2nd—A Clergyman is to be appointed to the Chaplaincy of the Gaols either by a minister of the above foreign court or by the respective *Grand Jury*. The former is a sworn enemy, bound down by inquisitorial tenets to exclude the loyal man and foist in the contrary character, who is himself an abettor of the rebellious principle that often brings the culprit to the gaol and dooms him to his solitary cell, and sometimes to the gibbet. On the contrary, it is natural to suppose, that the Grand Juries will from constitutional principles and liege fidelity, appoint the most faithful, the most upright, and the man, who is most sincerely attached to his king and his country, to fill the ostensible situation of a Chaplain.

3d—Can it be reasonably expected, that a Priest, *under the influence of a foreign court*, chosen and appointed by its minister and faithful officer, will be in opposition to both, and attached to the constitution they abhor and the government they despise? By no means, but on the contrary he must become hostile to both, or else be marked with infamy and loaded with anathemas. But, alas! deep rooted enmity—an enmity, which may be said

to be sucked in at the breast, and which every circumstance of after life tends to confirm, exposes few, very few indeed, to such censures.

Now in consideration of the above reasons and undoubted facts, it is exclusively imperative on the Grand Juries, according to the letter of the law, to appoint Roman Catholic Priests to fill the responsible situations alluded to; and not to give up their right in making the appointments, even in conjunction with, or by the permission of the Bishops, who are adverse to this wise and necessary measure enacted by the law; and of course, any man appointed by them, directly or indirectly cannot be depended upon. Otherwise the appointments will not be made according to the spirit of the law and importance of the case. And for this reason I did not consult Dr. Troy, or ask his leave to officiate in Newgate, until I was first appointed by the *Grand Jury*.

To obviate the evils and bad consequences resulting from the preposterous choice of an Anti-monarchical Superior, the *Grand Juries* ought to be circumspect and keep these appointments exclusively in their own hands; for it is a remedy against an evil; although the *Priests*, especially the *Prelates* will tell us, and assure their subjects, "that the appointment of a *Grand Jury*, and the salary granted the Roman Catholic Clergyman, are deep schemes of Government, to weaken the Roman Catholic Religion and proselyte the subject, as was said of the establishment of Maynooth College, and the grant of eight thousand a

year for its support. And whereas the said *Grand Juries* are not restrained, they ought to look for the liberal and faithful Clergyman, not only within the limits of a confined parish or few streets, among the small number of two or three Priests, but in surrounding parishes and proximate dioceses, and sometimes all over the land, as prudence will dictate and necessity require. It might be difficult enough to find *one proper man among many*, therefore the choice should be made among many. There is another most cogent reason, why the *Grand Juries* all over Ireland, should be exact and positive in making the appointments themselves, and preventing the salary from being paid to any, except to the Clergymen nominated by themselves alone. “When the Bishop appoints, it will be a creature of his own he selects, who will not or dare not presume to preach or teach any doctrine or inculcate any principles, but those contained in the *inquisitorial system* and dictated by his superior, to whom he is thankful for his appointment and for the salary he receives; and by whom he expects shortly to be promoted to a better living, and therefore will not displease his master or incur his displeasure.—But the man appointed by the *Grand Jury* under the Statute, is thereby rendered independent of the arbitrary power and uncontrouled *tyranny of an overbearing Prelate*. Such a man can preach the Gospel and point out errors, remove prejudices, and instil loyal and liberal principles: (*There is an example of this fundamental truth now in existence.*)—Such a man is thankful to his King and his Government

from whom he receives his support, his liberty, and his protection; he is grateful to the *Grand Jury* for his appointment; he is conscious to himself of the indispensable obligations contracted by the inestimable favors conferred, and therefore neither *menaces* or *flatteries*, *censures* or *promises*, will prevail to prevent him from clinging to his *King and Constitution*, and promoting their interest:—Thus will the man of fortitude, independence and honesty act, when the parasite and time-keeper will run away, and betray the trust put in him by deserting his post, and deceiving his friends. *The loyal and ever-praise-worthy Grand Jury of Dublin* always acted according to the spirit of the law, the trust reposed in them, and the legal authority with which they are invested, in making appointments to the Roman Catholic Chaplaincy of Newgate, &c. as also in the proper discharge of every other trust, in spite of all the opposition of *besotted bigotry*, *episcopal prejudices* and *anti-monarchical Journals*. Now let us point out the necessity, utility, and justice of this Constitutional Statute.

1st—It is well known that the *horrid System of the Court of Rome*, called, “*the Holy Inquisition*” did spread its baneful effects all over the Catholic Countries of Europe, and other places besides, where Monarchs were and are to be deposed, and their subjects to be *absolved from their Oaths of Allegiance*, and encouraged to rebel against, and overturn certain constitutions, for political and religious purposes, &c.

To encounter and remedy all these evils effectually, two things are essentially requisite,

viz. Legislative power and fidelity of the Clergy; physical force to prevent their external operations, and the loyalty of the Priests to eradicate the cause from whence they proceed, and substitute fidelity to the reigning Sovereign, and firm attachment to the Established Laws. The first has been already *accomplished by the Reformation—the second remains yet to be done*—*The bough has been lopped off, but the root remains still alive*, and will shoot forth new branches of *insubordination, insurrection, &c. every succeeding year*, until this root shall be effectually eradicated. How to accomplish this desirable and absolutely necessary object, is the province of those invested with *civil powers, and legal authorities*. I would beg the indulgence of submitting to my readers, the subsequent observations on this important subject.

The Priests of Ireland say, and are convinced, “that their *Glebes, Church-livings, and honorary Titles*, are in the possession of *strangers, enemies and heretics*, and that *no right, title, or law*, can *deprive* them of the just and canonical claim they have to enjoy these ecclesiastical possessions, and clerical dignities, because they say and hold that no prescription can be established on earth, against the Church of Rome and interest of her Clergy; and for these reasons a change in the constitution is wished for.

On the other hand, they have no canonical collations of, or security in their present livings, in Munster, Connaught, &c. as I have proved before by the Canon Law, and of course they are removeable at the will and caprice of their

superiors. Therefore a change in the administration of their own ecclesiastical laws, *is very desirable.*

There are twenty-six Dioceses in Ireland, besides the Wardenship of Galway; in each Diocese there are from thirty to forty parishes in general, and each parish is, on an average, worth some hundreds of pounds: the entire accumulate to a very large amount. Although this vast sum, is considered the voluntary contributions of the people, it is properly speaking, the property of the subject, and often enforced by virtue of diocesan statutes. and avarice of pastors, against the free will of the people. *This large property is at the mere will and disposal of the Bishops,* for the purpose of *supporting the influence of foreign power,* and their own dominion over the minds and morals of priests and laity. This property they can give and take away again without any controul, and thus keep the priests enslaved, and as instruments in their hands to achieve their designs and execute their plans. This property of the subject is often applied *against the welfare of the State, and tranquillity of the Country.* These unhappy effects will always follow from the present system of managing parochial emoluments, of conferring and depriving again of ecclesiastical benefices, and keeping the clergy enthralled in a state of suspense and perpetual uncertainty, until the *Government* shall take the management of this property, and disposal of the benefices and appointments of the clergy to ecclesiastical preferments, into their own hands *exclusively*—(This is the practice in other countries)—and until they will de-

lend their honour, and secure their livings against the foes of Church and State, by the enactment of an unlimited VETO," !! which should extend to all ecclesiastical orders, among the Clergy. It is then the current would change its course; it is then the support of the priest and his state of independence on *Pope* or *Bishop*, would have the contrary effect, and attach him to his *King*, his *Government* and his *Country*.

Let us now consider the doleful condition and dangerous predicament of the Irish Priests !! They have no political protection against the intrigues of a foreign court, they have no civil or ecclesiastical remedy against the tyranny and oppression of spiritual superiors : they have no fixed or permanent property from the *foreign power they are enslaved to* ; they have no tie, according to the present system, of the benefices they hold ; in short they are like aliens, without a stake or property either in Church or State, at home or abroad. What then can be expected from men of feelings and men of knowledge thus situated, thus isolated ? May I relate the inclination of the human mind by the veracity of human events ?

"They would wish for a Roman Catholic monarch, who would restore their glebes and church-livings, or at least secure their benefices and ecclesiastical preferments, by civil interference and coercive measures ; who would protect their honour and reputation, by legal investigations in the ecclesiastical courts : They would aid and assist the accomplishment of that object, without scruple or remorse of conscience, whilst

they despair of any amelioration of their present condition. For they say, "Why should we be faithful to those, who would not secure our livings, and protect our honour against tyranny and calumny? Why should we prevent the misfortunes and downfall of those, who see ours and would not apply a remedy, and make the necessary laws that would secure themselves and protect us; whereby treasonable plots and dangerous machinations would be discovered, and hidden things brought to light? Let the law be made in our favour, and we shall act in favour of our king and country."

All foreign bulls and decrees, all *domestic* ecclesiastical statutes, ordinances and regulations affecting the subject, &c. should be minutely and indiscriminately examined, without any reservations, conditions, ties or oaths (which could and are easily dispensed with) by a select number of loyal Clergy and Laity, before such Bulls, Decrees, &c. should be allowed to be put in force. Nothing material or of a serious nature, purporting to be from our ecclesiastical superiors abroad, or dictated by our Prelates at home, should be attended to by any, or allowed to operate without producing proper authority by a fair document; as dangerous intrigues and treasonable plots could be devised and practised for ever, between this country and foreign enemies, by personal intercourse and private information. On the above principles did many Roman Catholic Kings and Roman Catholic Governments, enact laws against the inroads and tyranny of the court of Rome and co-operation of clerical subjects:

and with greater reason should *Protestant Kings and Protestant Governments*, establish laws, and use precautions for similar reasons. But I might be asked, how could these *VERO-ISTICAL LAWS* be established without the consent of the Court of Rome and concurrence of the Clergy and Prelates of *Ireland*, as there were overtures made, on the occasion, for the adjustment of mutual differences; and that a system of refusal prevailed among the Roman Catholic Clergy and Laity? I shall first remark that the Court of Rome does not consult the Court of *England* in the formation and enactment of her laws and constitutions, made for the good of the subject and support of the realm. Neither is the British Court obliged to consult Rome or the subjects of that ecclesiastical court in establishing laws for the preservation of the constitution, good of the subject and tranquillity of the country. The only thing left for the establishment of this necessary law is, to make the *act*, and leave every man at his own discretion to embrace or reject it; then, and only then, can the loyal and disloyal Priest be known, as his fears and apprehensions of ecclesiastical censures and spoliations would be happily removed by such a statute: It is then the faithful Clergyman could with impunity, preach up true loyalty and reprobate all inquisitorial schemes, and disavow all foreign claims—It is then the people could be enlightened and prejudices removed—It is then the great influence of the Roman Catholic Clergymen and the executive power, would become an everlasting consolidation against the

united combinations of foreign power and domestic enemies. There is no other resource or alternative for reconciling and attaching the Clergy to the crown—or for bringing the people (through the medium of clerical influence) to a sense of true fidelity and due subordination. Let the change be first wrought in the Clergy, by the adoption of this *act*, which will make a legal provision for their support, that cannot be taken away from them by episcopal tyranny and clerical treachery, that will secure their honour and support their independence; and then a change, in the people, will inevitably follow; otherwise all attempts for effecting a reconciliation and reformation will be in vain. Hence the necessity of the statute made in favour of the Chaplains of the Gaols and Prisons of Ireland—Hence the fidelity and sagacity of the Grand Jury of Dublin, in insisting upon their right of appointment, and putting the law in force, notwithstanding all the opposition given them, by those who endeavour to annul the civil law as well as the true ecclesiastical law. Let the rest of the *Grand Juries of Ireland* follow the example of the *Grand Jury of Dublin*, and it is more than probable, that we shall shortly have faithful Roman Catholic Priests in all the Gaols and Penitentiaries of Ireland, who will discharge their duty to God and man, in spite of all the censures of Bishops and calumny of Parish Priests; and expose their plots and schemes, &c. without the least danger of the doors of said Gaols, &c. being nailed up against them, as the doors of the Chapels of Oning and Tem-

pleorum were against me; without any danger of being deprived of their salaries, illegally and tyrannically, as I was of my parochial emoluments. And thus by example and co-operation, they will be instrumental in establishing an *Ecclesiastical Veto*, without which no security, peace or happiness can be expected.

Let us now reflect for a moment on the different appointments of, and different objections made to the Roman Catholic Chaplains of Newgate—

Previous to the Act of Parliament in 1810, by which a salary was allowed to the Chaplains of different persuasions, who were and are to be appointed by the Grand Juries, there was at that time, a Protestant, Presbyterian and Roman Catholic Clergyman, doing clerical duties, for several years, gratis in Newgate. The Grand Jury judiciously and justly said “that these Gentlemen, who were bestowing their labours for a series of years without any emolumentary consideration, had a prior right to the salary now granted by Government,” and for this just reason they appointed the Clergymen in possession. Though the Rev. Mr. Murphy, R. C. Priest, was of a different Parish from that in which Newgate is situated, there was never a question of his right, title or incapacity, whilst he was doing the business of a chaplain gratis; but as soon as there was a question of a hundred a year, then, indeed; he had no right or title; he did not belong to the Parish, no other Clergyman could officiate, but one of the Priests belonging to the Parish,

who should be appointed by the Roman Catholic Bishop or Parish Priest: Therefore Mr. Murphy became all at once an alien, unfit to officiate as usual, *quite incapacitated*; all his ecclesiastical functions charitably and canonically administered before, are now become in a single moment sacrilegious and invalid. Oh! admirable change!!!! the sacraments lose their virtue, the administration of the Priest is profane, and he is in an instant transformed, from being a mild shepherd, into a ravenous wolf, devouring the flock. What can be the stupendous cause of the admirable change? Nothing indeed but the salary of a hundred per annum, and to prevent Government from having any influence among the Roman Catholic Clergy, or controul over the arbitrary power of the Irish Bishops, and to render the appointment of the Grand Jury nugatory. And why did not the writer, who styled himself, "*A Catholic*," in his indecent and unjustifiable attack both on the *Grand Jury* and on myself, December the 5th, 1820, in "*Carriek's Morning Post*," mention, that the Rev. Mr. Murphy, was the first Clergyman appointed by the Grand Jury, and the first turned out of that situation by the Bishop and Parish Priest? *Mr. Catholic*, the *Secretary of the Irish Inquisition* will say, "that would expose and condemn the conduct of superiors, who approved of, and sanctioned the ecclesiastical administration of this Priest previous to the grant of an annual salary;—but that the hundred a year had such wonderful attractions; and supernaturally operated on

this poor Clergyman's spiritual faculties and clerical functions so far as to induce his superiors to pronounce them null and void, if he did not immediately resign his situation and disavow having any claim on the salary—The poor Priest resigned his Benefice, to avoid suspensions and ecclesiastical censures, whether just or unjust, right or wrong, as I shall relate before I will finish the subject. Besides by being candid and honest, Mr. C. would incur the obloquy of his spiritual superiors, lose their interest, and would not any longer be employed for the purpose of disseminating spurious canons and *erroneous productions, for exorbitant prices, at clerical marts*. Therefore he prefers untruths to honesty, base interest to christian principle, and declares, to his eternal shame, that Mr. Murphy's successor in Newgate, (called by him the *mad Priest*) was the first appointed by the *Grand Jury*. This Mr. C. in his *frantic phraseologies*, without shame or remorse, announces, "that the first Priest appointed by the *Grand Jury* was a *mad man*, but a pattern of piety!!!" I never before understood that a *mad man*, could be a pious man, or that *mad piety* could be an example for imitation. But we must forgive Mr. C. this absurdity and inconsistency, when he verily believes that every *mad man* is a pious man, because he himself is one of the former number!!! Look at him, behold his physiognomy with an attentive eye!!! Mr. C. proceeds and asserts, (by the will and permission of his employers) "that the next man appointed by the *Grand Jury* was a *Spaniard*,

who could not speak a word of English to the prisoners;" who, in general, understand nothing else. No man, possessed of common sense, could for a moment suppose, that such a respectable, wise and intelligent body of Gentlemen, as the *Grand Jury* of Dublin always are, would make such an unreasonable appointment, and expose themselves to public censures and public obloquy, as Mr. C. does himself, by his ungentlemanly and malignant invectives. Some of the clergy and gentlemen of this city, declared to me that they conversed with this *foreigner* in the English language, and said he understood and spoke it well. The *Grand Jury* appointed next, a loyal character from the city or county of *Limerick*, on condition that he would live in Dublin; but Mr. C. gave this appointment a construction of his own, and said "that he might live in Limerick, and step to Dublin occasionally, to answer sick calls in the prisons, and that the *Grand Jury* required no more. Oh! base calumny!!! He (Mr. C.) should know that a Clergyman could not discharge his duty by living at a long distance from Newgate, and giving private instructions elsewhere; as a *Chamber Lawyer*, (incapable of attending at the bar of the four courts,) gives and receives in private episcopal inquisitorial rooms and vicarial chambers!! At last Mr. C. treats of my own appointment, and represents me as a suspended and disqualified Priest; I must tell you Mr. C. that you are a poor divine and no canonist, and therefore no Judge. In short, he pointed out all the Clergymen chosen by the *Grand Jury*

as mad, refractory, disgraced, incapable and suspended Priests. Notwithstanding all these bad qualifications and incapacities, (as Mr. C. relates) they were acting as Clergymen and performing the most awful, holy and sublime offices in the Catholic Church, which is a proof (*if we are to believe the Secretary of the holy Inquisition in Ireland*) that the *worst characters* and *depraved Clergymen* are allowed to officiate and hold situations in that church. He acknowledges the fact and pays the *established church* this high compliment and respect, viz. "that such irregular and depraved Priests should not be appointed to any spiritual or ecclesiastical situations by *Protestants*, because by such appointments they become *Protestant Clergymen*, but, in consequence of their immoralities and disqualifications, are not worthy enough for the *Protestant church, or any other, except the Roman church*, which will receive and employ any ROTTEN MEMBER," &c. &c. &c.

But I might be asked the reason, why my predecessors in Newgate resigned and quitted that situation after being duly appointed by the *Grand Jury* of Dublin. I shall quote the reason as I have it from *Doctor Troy's* own mouth. When there was a statute made by Parliament for the wise and necessary reasons already described; there was in direct opposition to it, *another Inquisitorial Statute made* in Dublin, by the Ordinary of the Diocess, in order to annul and undo the former.

The first of December, 1820, I acquainted Doctor Troy that I was appointed by the *Grand Jury* to the Chaplaincy of Newgate, &c. and

requested his permission to officiate in that situation, and hoped that he would not oppose my appointment; his answer was, "Sir, I made a Diocesan Law or Statute, by which every priest is prohibited under pain of suspension, to officiate in any gaol, prison, or bridewell, &c. in the arch-diocese of Dublin, except he is *exclusively appointed by myself*; and any priest who receives, or consents to the appointment of the *Grand Jury*, even without officiating, is by the fact of receiving it, suspended, and shall remain so, during the will and pleasure of the Bishop—the law is made, and I shall adhere to, and support it." He would not sanction the appointment, or grant the request I made, but in consequence of receiving my appointment from the enlightened and liberal *Grand Jury of Dublin*, he withdrew from me the faculties he gave a few days before. I then told his Lordship, that I was convinced he could not deprive me without cause and conviction, of the powers and faculties I received from God, through the *merits of Jesus Christ*, and for that reason would in compliance with the divine command of the Saviour of the world, officiate—"Go and teach, preach and baptize, &c. wherever you are received." I was received in Dublin, therefore I shall *teach and preach the word of God there* according to the admonition of my Saviour, in, *spite of the Devil, Priests and Bishops!!!*

It was in consequence of the above prohibitions, under pain of suspension, &c. that the different Chaplains appointed for Newgate, &c. resigned and quitted that situation, which I shall confirm by transcribing the following

notes, I received from Doctor Troy and some of his clerical Inquisitors, whom he let loose for several days, throughout the city in pursuit of the *Heretic*, until at last they made out his lodgings in South Great George's-street. Thank God that there were no *Inquisitorial Catacombs* in that street.

Rev. Dear Sir,

I sent you a note this night from Most Rev. Doctor Troy, and would wish to say one or two words to yourself, as a friend, which I am. Rev. Dear Sir, very sincerely,

RICHARD KENRICK.

Saturday-night,

December 2, 1820,—Francis-street,

Rev. Mr. Morrissey.

The one word or two were to admonish me against the dangers I was encountering; the censures I would incur, and the maledictions that should follow, &c.

Cavendish-Row,

Tuesday, 28th November, 1820.

REV. SIR,

You have no faculty from me to exercise or perform any ecclesiastical functions in this Arch-diocese, I presume you will not attempt it. I remain, Rev. Sir, your humble Servant in Christ,

J. T. TROY.

To the Rev. Laurence Morrissey.

The Doctor being apprehensive that the foregoing would not suffice, I got the following note the same day:—

Canendish-Row,

Dublin, 28th November, 1820.

REV. SIR,

I hereby inform you, that you have no faculty from me to celebrate mass or to exercise any ecclesiastical function within the Arch-diocese of Dublin. I remain, Rev. Sir, your humble Servant in Christ,

J. T. TROY.

To the Rev. Laurence Morrissey.

After reading the above I was and am firmly convinced, that if stipends or salaries were given for saying the Lord's Prayer, or for reading the divine office, they would be prohibited under pain of censures also; as the mass is.

Whereas such proceedings are taken now to counteract the legislative power and benevolence of Government; and whereas such unconstitutional measures are resorted to, before Catholic Emancipation is granted, by those who are considered loyal men, I ask what could be expected when the same men would be invested with legal authority, citing, commanding, restraining and prescribing in the Imperial Parliament? The experiment would be more precarious than gentlemen in general do, or can imagine. When the above prohibitions did not deter me from the discharge of my clerical duties and pastoral functions, and had not the desired effect as they usually

have had on weak minds and cringing subjects, some Roman Catholic Clergy and Laity, advised me to resign my situation under Government, before the Catholic Emancipation would take place the ensuing Session of Parliament. They positively declared, if I did not consider myself previous to that period, I should then give up my situation, be disgraced, and become the outcast of the people for ever more. I asked would the Roman Catholic Bishops, Clergy and Laity have that extraordinary power, in the event of Catholic Emancipation taking place? The reply was—"they positively would, and could not be refused any demand they would think proper to make, because Government would be afraid to do so!" The general opinion and firm belief of Roman Catholics are, that after the Catholic Emancipation shall be granted, the Protestant constitution will become a Roman Catholic one; that the Protestants will change their national creed and turn Catholics; and that the established church shall necessarily crumble to the ground, and be no more. This is the language, the sentiments and ardent wishes—I frequently witnessed such exclamations—such expectations.—

After my appointment, the Prisoners attended their duty in the most exemplary manner that could be expected, and heard me in their respective chapels with devotion and piety; they were quite submissive and attentive to my instructions and the word of God, and there was a visible change for the better in their conduct and morals, as all those who preside

over them could testify; until Priests and Bishops interfered and sowed the seed of sedition and disaffection among the poor culprits and debtors, throughout the Gaols and Penitentiaries: Some of them declared publicly, that the Bishop sent them a man to request they should not hear me, as I was not appointed by himself. Several Priests spoke publicly and privately, in these prisons, &c. against my character; they represented me as a refractory man, as a suspended and excommunicated Priest. I forgive them, for, I am sure, they do not know whether they are thus branded themselves or not *by the divine and ecclesiastical law!!!* They impressed an *idea* on the minds of others that I was deprived of my faculties, and that all my clerical functions are null and void. I pity their blindness and gross ignorance, for I am certain, they are no judges; and that they do not know whether they are or not; and that they are equally ignorant of the validity or invalidity of their own clerical functions, according to the sacred canons and holy Fathers. They have inculcated, that they would be guilty of a mortal sin if they should receive any sacrament from my hands, and of a violation of the law of their church, in case they would receive any spiritual consolation through my administration. These Clergymen would have a larger *field* and *more merit* by admonishing a *certain portion of the community* not to go to those Priests who pollute the *sacred tribunal* by *shameful solicitations*, and after the *horrible deeds*, pronounce invalid absolutions and confer the

holy sacraments with their own sacrilegious hands on those whom they have seduced through the wicked administration of the sacred pledges of eternal salvation—to those, who have led thousands into error and will be the ultimate cause of their eternal damnation. The confined culprits were made to understand, that I became a Heretic and a Protestant Priest, in consequence of being appointed by the Grand Jury, according to an act of Parliament, and consequently, that I intended to make them all protestants. Several of the priests often visited the poor prisoners under the hypocritical mask of affording spiritual consolation, when, at the same time their only object was to alienate them from their legal Chaplain, through religious prejudice and inveterate enmity. One day a certain priest sauntering and sneaking about in Richmond Bridewell, went into the mess-hall at the male side, to deliver his instructions to the young felons there; but was it the gospel of peace?—no, verily, but the doctrine of his *master*.

After whispering about (for fear the turn-key, who presided, and was a Protestant should hear him,) and communicating his low and base insinuations, he advanced to the head of the table, and addressed his audience as follows: “Boys, I will be here on Sunday next to officiate, will you come and hear me in the Chapel?” they, being previously instructed, replied, Yes, Sir, we will: “But, Boys, I understand, said he, there is another priest to come and give you prayers; what will you do when he comes?” They said, we will rise up and go out of the chapel;

"That's right, that's right boys—but remember I did not bid you !!!"

After finishing his mission among the male Prisoners, he goes to the female side, and instructs them in the same holy calling, and to the same effect that he had instructed the male malefactors before; he then retires after impressing a spirit of hostility and assassination. Then the women consulted how they could forward and execute the views of the *Holy Father*:—They took the rock-sticks of their spinning wheels and concealed them in the chimney of the room they worked in, and bound themselves down by an oath, to dash out my brains the next time I should make my appearance among them. The plot was happily discovered before they got any opportunity of executing the plan and will of the *Holy Fathers*.

The prisoners at every side were now closely watched and their weapons secured. Still for fear they should be altogether unworthy of the wholesome admonitions they received, on the Sunday following some of the men flung hats on the altar and put out the candles; the women screamed out to stimulate them to acts of violence, a general confusion took place—alarming symptoms of murder and outrage appeared, but by the praiseworthy vigilance and activity of the protestant officers and matrons of the institution, peace and security were restored in the course of time.

Another day the same clergyman visited a sick woman in said Bridewell, turned out the Matron, who was a Protestant, and called into the patient's room three Roman Catholic women,

the most violent and turbulent in the criminal community, and delivered his instructions to them; who immediately communicated the same to the rest; the result was a general commotion throughout the whole establishment, and much trouble and anxiety to those who presided over the deluded prisoners.

At other times, some clergymen encouraged and sanctioned by superiors, would go into the yards and private cells of other gaols, when the chapels were prohibited them, to infuse the spirit of combination and assassination. The prisoners were roused up to that degree of religious frenzy as to machinate my death in *Newgate*. They brought on the Sabbath, a large stone into the chapel to dash out my brains on the altar—some confusion took place among themselves, as if to determine, who should give the fatal blow—by which means the plot was discovered.

I shall pass by unnoticed, several other alarming appearances of a similar nature. Providence was the principle cause of my miraculous escape; and after that, I am indebted, for the preservation of my life, to the judges, magistrates, grand jury, gentlemen, Protestant gaolers, &c. who have the superintendence and government of the institutions I attend. Forbearance, mutual co-operation, and the moral instructions of those who preside, together with my own feeble exertions, at length prevailed, and caused a visible change throughout the several gaols and bridewells, in spite of all the efforts of priests, bishops, and laity to render them insubordinate, vicious, and immoral.—*Inquisitorial machinations and intrigues all over.*

It is quite evident from the single fact I am now to relate, that it is not the salvation of the prisoners they have at heart but *certain views of their own*.

One day a woman was taken suddenly ill in one of these gaols—I was immediately sent for, to administer the rights of the church to her, but was not then at home; as soon as I returned, I went, without delay, to the gaol, but unhappily the poor woman was dead before my arrival. The parochial house, where five or six priests reside, is quite convenient to this gaol; one of said priests was in the-habit of attending the gaol occasionally, and latterly sowed the seeds of discord and sedition there, to the great annoyance of the gaoler, deputy gaoler, legal chaplain, and great disedification of the inmates, until at length it was found absolutely necessary to object to this clergyman, for the purpose of keeping peace and good order. As soon as it was found that I was not at home, a messenger called on a priest from the parochial house, to attend the dying woman; no clergyman would go as there was an objection made to the gentleman alluded to; and thus they permitted the woman to die without sacraments; and immediately it was industriously reported, that she died without the rights of the church through my fault and neglect. This happened on Saturday evening when the priests are at home hearing confessions. This was a true cause for suspending said priests, still no such thing was inflicted.

It would justly appear that it was a designed thing to permit this poor woman to die without

the sacraments—First, in order to stigmatize my character in the face of the public, by circulating a report that I would let the people die without the rights of the church; and secondly, to facilitate their own free access to the gaols, and cause my removal, by convincing the Government that the Prisoners would prefer dying without sacraments, rather than to have me administer to them. The attempt was in contemplation, but, on reflection, they declined to bring the business forward, as the neglect of attending the person in question was obviously their own fault. I am sorry they were not so desirous to prepare this woman for death, as they are to prepare the men when condemned to die at Newgate. But their object, on these occasions, would appear quite different.

Dying people, particularly those who are to die by the laws of the country, are to make a general confession of all their sins and malpractices during their lives past. Women in general have nothing to confess, of a political or treasonable nature; we all know, without any sacramental knowledge, that such treasonable practices, plots and schemes are confined to men, especially those condemned to the gibbet, for the same or some other outrages. Now as it is the custom to reveal sacramental confessions, it is apprehended that if I was allowed to hear the confessions of these culprits, I might imitate the Inquisitorial Priests and reveal their confessions (with or without the penitent's free will and permission) to civil authorities, for the preservation of the pro-

testant church and state, as others do for their extermination; and therefore it is advisable and dictatorial (in order to take away this opportunity from the *Protestant Priest*, so called) to make application to the Government or some other Gentlemen in power, to permit these Priests to hear the confessions of the men who are sentenced to die. I am confident no permission would be granted if the scheme was properly known. And besides by such permission, they want to shew others that I am still unqualified and unworthy to attend and administer, &c. As the inquisitorial system operated thus in the Gaols and Bridewells of Dublin, by clerical influence, so does the same operate throughout all Ireland at present by the same influence, which might be known, if faithful Priests dare reveal the fact, as I have done; which they would do, if their persons and livings, were secured to them by vetoistical interference,

Let us consider for the moment, whether it is the salvation of the prisoners, the good of religion and discipline of the church, or the prevention of the Veto and civil power over ecclesiastical tyranny, the Bishops have in view in combining against me, in order to deprive me of my present situation, as they did before of my Parish; in conspiring against the authority of the Grand Juries of Ireland, by applications to Secretaries, and high Authorities in order to divest them of the legal power of appointment to the Chaplaincies of the Gaols, &c. and in investing themselves with the same—and thereby to repeal and annul a

statute made by a liberal Government for the good of the subject.

With respect to the first point, let us weigh the nature of mortal sin according to the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. "Mortal sin is the greatest injury or insult we can offer the Deity; it deprives the soul of sanctifying grace and condemns it to the eternal flames of hell, unless repented for in this life. It is a greater evil than all the misfortunes of life, than wars, plagues, famines, &c. than even the annihilation of all the universe." Can we now enumerate all the mortal sins the unfortunate prisoners and the unhappy chaplain appointed by the Grand Jury are guilty of, according to the doctrine delivered to them by Priests and Bishops:—"My good people do not be deceived any longer—Mr. Morrissy is a depraved man for being appointed by the Grand Jury, and not by his Bishop. He is under censures for accepting of this situation and guilty of mortal sin—he incurred an irregularity, and is excommunicated, for officiating by the authority of the Grand Jury and the Government, and therefore, he is guilty of another mortal sin—as often as he officiates, gives or receives any sacrament, he commits a mortal sin—viz. as often as he celebrates mass he commits a mortal sin—if he would absolve ten, a hundred or a thousand persons in a day, he commits as many numerical mortal sins; if he would give the holy sacrament to a thousand or ten thousand people (if possible) in one day, he would be guilty of as many mortal sins, &c. If he retracts and renews his

intention again, he is guilty of all again in the sight of God, and that as often as he retracts and reiterates, &c. You yourselves commit a mortal sin, as often as you shall go to his mass, hear his prayers or listen to his instructions ; when you go to confession, receive the blessed eucharist, or when you are anointed by him, you are guilty of mortal sin each time, one of which would damn you for ever ; there are as many grievous sins committed every Sunday as there are people in the chapel attending him. These mortal sins will, increase and remain in your souls as long as you shall attend and apply to him. If you wish to do penance for these enormous sins, despise Morrissey, and attend no more—I will procure leave from the Bishop to absolve you ; but if you fall again, woe be to you, for your last state will be worse than your former,” &c. &c. This extraordinary catalogue of mortal sins, terrified some of the ignorant and prejudiced prisoners, and caused them to go to the protestant chaplain of the established church: But according to the same doctrine, they stepped from the frying pan into the fire ; for in that case they became heretics all at once, and incurred a censure from which no Priest could absolve them, (but the Bishop or his Vicar General) without permission. *The Holy Fathers* will cry out:—“ Do you not know what the Minister is ? He is the disciple of Satan and son of Luther—do you not know that he is excommunicated by the whole church, since the days of the apostate Luther and damnable King Henry VIII. You commit a mortal sin as often as you attend and lis-

ten to his prayers, as often as you hear his sermons, and read protestant books on religious subjects—as often as you receive any sacrament from him; in a word, as often as you will commune with any minister of any other profession in spiritual or ecclesiastical rites, or listen to protestants reading or explaining the bible. You are to know that protestants, methodists, quakers, &c. will never be saved, and shall never go to Heaven!!! This is an article of your faith, which you must verily believe, or else you will be damned for ever as well as they: shall be: for it is a mortal sin to believe otherwise.” What shall the poor prisoner do then, when every door is closed against him? nothing but to remain in his solitary cell, and not to attempt going to church, chapel or meeting. And what is he then—nothing else but a publican or a heathen. Oh!! is there any power in Heaven or on earth, that could put a stop to all these calamities, remove these mortal mountains, and turn these torrents of iniquity from their original source. Yes, reader, if you are not incredulous, I will inform you, that one or two words from the Bishop will do the whole. To wit,—“Mr. Morrissy, I permit you to officiate in the Prisons”—or shorter, “I grant you faculties”—or shorter again, “Officiate”!!!

When a man can so easily avert all these misfortunes, prevent all these innumerable sins and the eternal loss of souls, according to their own doctrine, and will not do it, can it be supposed for the moment that he has the salvation of souls at heart? can it be ima-

gined even that he himself is possessed of any religion? can it be believed that his principles are any thing else but deistical, that his designs are any thing else but inquisitorial?

2ndly—The true discipline of the church, with respect to ecclesiastical superiors and the subject is, that superiors are to command and enforce obedience according to the law of God, real religion and the civil constitution of the realm: The subject is strictly bound to obey, when commanded by virtue of said laws and constitutions, and no farther; but on the contrary, he is absolutely bound to disobey and reject any orders that would infringe on, or militate against these laws and statutes. *Cum Episcopus jubet, quæ sunt contraria legibus divinis et humanis, ei obediendum non est.* When a bishop commands whatever is contrary to the divine and human laws, he is not to be obeyed. This is the true discipline of the *christian church*, against which I was and am commanded to act, by giving up my right to clerical duties and pastoral functions, and by resigning my present situation against the divine laws of God, and legal authorities of my country. For these and many more reasons, those superiors, who are industriously endeavouring to dispossess me of the responsible situation I hold, are not actuated by the discipline of the true church, or interest of the Constitution, but by their own monopolizing system of ecclesiastical rights and temporal authority.

3rdly. The inquisitorial system, and executive Veto are two different powers, one contending against the other. The former is established

for the subjugation of all Protestant Monarchs, and subversion of all Protestant Constitutions, for political purposes and self interest. The latter is established in many countries against the anti-monarchical intrusion of the court of Rome, and the ecclesiastical monopoly and tyranny of the prelates over the subject. And whereas Roman Catholic monarchs found it necessary to establish such a Veto in their realms, much more so is it necessary to have it established in this country, to guard against future evils that will inevitably happen if not prevented by the adoption of such a measure—than which, nothing is more alarming to the Irish hierarchy, and Catholic adherents.

The best services that government can do for Roman Catholics and their religion in Ireland, are considered by priests, bishops, and the laity in general a government policy, in order to weaken the Roman Catholic religion, lessen ecclesiastical influence, and attach as many of their clergy to the said Government as possible, for the express purpose of destroying their church in the end: For instance—the *grant* for the support of the college of Maynooth is considered a government policy, in order to weaken the Catholic church, to lessen the influence of the Irish hierarchy, and corrupt the morals of the students, by lay-interference, &c. To obviate these evils and anti-catholic views, (as they say) it was and is in contemplation to establish Diocesan Academies and withdraw the subject from the Royal College. Some of the bishops have already put their resolutions in force and accomplished their designs, by le-

vying and requiring heavy contributions from clergy and laity, for the building of seminaries and support of the students.

The statute made, the salary allowed, and the appointment of Roman Catholic Chaplains by the Grand Juries of Ireland, to gaols and bridewells are judged and considered by those on whom the favours are conferred, a political design of Government also, to commence the establishment of a Veto ; and for that purpose to appoint the most loyal and most attached to the Constitution to these situations,—and seduce them to become Government priests, and be instrumental in their hands, in order to weaken the power of the court of Rome, and lessen the influence of the bishops of this country.

Now they are panic-struck at my appointment and perseverance in my situation in spite of censures, calumnies, and every opposition, they did or could give,—devising and applying for the frustration of parliamentary schemes, so called, and my removal from this situation, that I should not be held up as a precedent and example of imitation.

I understand that the major part of the bishops met in this city, some time ago, and held a consultation for three days successively—that a petition was drawn up—that some of the prelates, together with some Roman Catholic gentlemen applied to the government and presented said petition for my removal—that after being disappointed in their bold efforts, they drew up a memorial to present to parliament (under pretexts of a different nature from what they had in view,) in order to cajole government to repeal

the *act*, divest the grand Juries of their legal authority, and invest themselves with the power of appointment to the chaplaincies—they entrusted a certain friend of their's with the management of this business, who, I believe without knowing their anti-monarchical views, made, some overtures on the occasion. However, although things did not turn out altogether according to their wishes, the last act is somewhat in their favour, whereas it recommends the choice and appointment of Roman Catholic Chaplains in future, to be made among the acting clergymen of the respective parishes where the gaols, &c. are situated, provided always that nothing to the contrary may appear just and necessary to the grand juries; otherwise the bishops would have an opportunity of preventing the appointment of good and faithful priests, and of foisting into these precarious situations, their own creatures, by leaving no other clergyman in said parishes, or appointing any to officiate in them except real and well-instructed Inquisitors, who would answer their own purpose.

These, besides many other reasons, are sufficient for the grand juries, to look for the loyal and faithful man among many, both far and near.

Mr. C. still pursues his usual bickerments, and inserts in the anti-monarchical prints, a misrepresentation of my conduct at the execution of Osborn, at Newgate, which was ably and satisfactorily refuted by the worthy sheriffs of the city of Dublin, as follows:—

"Being applied to on the part of the Rev. Mr. Morrissy, to state whether we disapproved of his conduct at the late execution at Newgate, we can have no hesitation in saying, that as far as came under our observation, Mr. Morrissy's conduct on the occasion alluded to, was perfectly correct, and only fulfilling the piety and zeal of the christian clergyman; and that we saw nothing in Mr. Morrissy's conduct to warrant the statement which has appeared in an evening paper of Thursday last."

GEORGE WHITEFORD, }
N. W. BRADY, } Sheriffs.

"The public will judge from the foregoing, how grossly and unwarrantably, the character of an innocent clergyman, has been misrepresented by the Dublin Evening Post, and the Weekly Register—Really such conduct may well be called the licentiousness of the Press.

"Hibernian Journal."

In common justice to the Proprietor and able writer of the *Hibernian Journal*, (Captain Fitzsimmons) I must confess that it was one of the most constitutional and independent Papers of our times; that it was a complete controller on inflammatory and anti-monarchical journals, in exposing their dangerous tendency and unconstitutional principles; that it is a serious loss to the impartial and sound part of the community to have lost such a source of genuine and necessary information on national and polemical subjects of vital interest; which other partial and time-keeping journalists endeavour

to keep the public ignorant of. *The Hibernian Journal* was always open to the loyal and honest man, to expose private intrigues and dangerous practices, when other journalists would refuse giving insertion to such important disclosures, which I could testify on different occasions. Mr. Catholic, spued out the malice of his heart and venom of his soul against me, in vindication of episcopal tyranny and episcopal usurpation.—I shall quote one instance, among many, to prove my assertion. In July, 1820, I inserted a document in the public prints, shewing the unjust cause of my persecutions and privation of my living. Mr. C. in his public vituperations, quoted a passage out of this document and changed it into bad English, and then said, “that the said document was exceedingly ill written,” in order to prevent the due impression it might make on the public mind. I shall now transcribe the passage and his mutilation. “I, the undersigned, consider myself in common justice, bound to the popular feelings and friendly anxiety of many, as well as for the self vindication of traduced innocence and lacerated character, to announce to the public at large, the real and exclusive cause of my long protracted and unprecedented persecutions, uncanonical deprivation of an ecclesiastical benefice, suspension of pastoral functions and clerical duties.”

Mr. C. writes the second last line of this paragraph thus, “uncanonically deprived of an ecclesiastical benefice, suspension of pastoral functions and clerical duties,” and then says,

“the letter is exceedingly ill written, &c.” After this base act Mr. C. should be ashamed to shew his face in the street, as well as he is ashamed to shew it in the four courts.

Is it possible that this Mr. Catholic could be the Roman Catholic Lawyer whom I consulted as a Chamber Lawyer on this occasion, and gave fees to; who said “that I was an injured man—that my Bishop acted contrary to the laws of his church and common justice; and said (as the law of the land would not probably take cognizance of the business) I should go to Rome and look for redress there.” He also declared, “if Dr. Marum would succeed in his cruel proceedings, it would be a woeful circumstance to the Parish Priests of Ireland.” When I was promised a trial, I applied to this Lawyer to become my advocate. I promised him a considerable sum of money, for attending in Kilkenny at said trial. He said, “he would first consult with a Dignitary of the Roman Catholic Church, in town, (Dublin) and that if he should advise him to advocate my cause, he would readily undertake it. This *sworn* inquisitorial Dignitary, (who can swear others too) did not permit the Counsellor to undertake the office. The said Counsellor then recommended to me, a friend of his own, to become my advocate, and promised, he would write me a note in the course of the day, and enclose in it a letter to his clerical advocate, which, he requested, I should deliver to him the following day. It is this:—

4th September, 1816.

REV. MR. MORRISSY.

Many circumstances, unnecessary to mention at present, have compelled me to defer to this late hour, the letter I promised to send to you by the penny post. The subjoined is to Father N. My acquaintance with him is sufficient to persuade me of his kindness and talent; and I have already sought through a common friend, to interest him for your cause. But I think it but fair towards you and towards myself, to suggest to you, that if you should think proper to avail yourself of such introduction as I can give, you will do best to make use of it without delay. Thus your own interest will be at once consulted; and it will ardently appear that your application to me had been not a temporary expedient hastily taken up and causelessly abandoned, but the result of some preference to my zeal, which preference I have requited sincerely by putting you and your case into the hands of a brave and eloquent champion. I remain, Rev. Sir, truly your humble servant,

N.

4th September, 1816.

REV SIR,

To-morrow this letter will be delivered to you by a client of mine, the Rev. Mr. Morrissy, a Parish Priest of the Diocess of Ossory. The narrative of his sufferings has interested me. But in this short letter it will be enough to state, that he has appealed from his Ordinary

to the Metropolitan in Dublin; that our Archbishop has entertained the appeal; that the trial is appointed for the 25th of this month in Kilkenny: that the bearer wishes me to become his advocate; which being impracticable, I have taken the liberty, to recommend in my place, that person, whom I should have named, were the case my own. I have named you to Mr. Morrissey, and he appoints you his advocate. Your conducting his case will be honourable. I think my anticipation of your success is not mere rashness. You may expect to be liberally rewarded. To you, and in such a case, what I have hitherto written, is an introduction sufficient. I remain, Rev. Sir, your obedient humble servant.

N.

To the Rev. Father N.

Superior of N.

I delivered this letter to the Rev. Father, who received another in the interim from the Counsellor, which the said clergyman read for me, and in which the Lawyer gave his legal opinion, "that I was an injured man." This Clergyman refused to interfere. It appears that the Lawyer was not so well versed in the inquisitorial law, as these Rev. Gentlemen were; that he did not understand that said Priests were bound by their office, &c. rather to oppose and condemn me than to advocate and support my cause.

A certain clamorous Roman Catholic Lawyer, in some of his inflammatory exclamations, without shame, true information or

remorse of conscience, proclaimed aloud at a public meeting, that the Grand Jury of Dublin appointed foreigners, madmen and degraded Priests, to the chaplaincy of Newgate. I ask this Counsellor, in case, that what he stated was a positive fact, which was it the Grand Jury or the Superiors of his own church made these Clergymen mad, unqualified, incapable, &c.? I ask him again, if said priests were the bad and refractory characters he publicly represented them to be, why were they allowed at the same time to officiate as clergymen in the Roman Catholic Church? Is it because such men are good enough for that Church? or is it because the superiors who ordained them, gave them faculties, and permitted them to officiate up to the very day of their appointment by the Grand Jury, and after resigning that situation too, are corrupt, unqualified, and incapable themselves? Or finally, is it because fidelity to the present Constitution and liberality of sentiments, contrary to deep rooted prejudices, made the extraordinary alterations, and rendered the clergymen alluded to so depraved and abandoned all at once? Every priest must be either a loyal man, or an inquisitor, or an idiot, or a madman. An inquisitor must be disposed, from an erroneous religious principle, or bound down by solemn oath, to exterminate all Heretics, or Protestants, and overturn their constitutions. The loyal priest, on the contrary, will love and cherish his Protestant brethren, though they may differ one from the other in religious tenets, and will support the Constitution, as a member, a subject,

and a Christian ; but mad priests will be quite indifferent what course things will take.

Now Inquisitorial Heir Apparent to * * * *
* * * * * *king of the Irish Rebels ! ! !*

may I take the liberty of telling you, that the Grand Juries are bound in conscience and justice to appoint loyal clergymen ; and in case they would not find such, they should prefer madmen, degraded priests, and emigrated clergymen, to domestic Inquisitors and sworn enemies ; as the one class will do more good and less harm than the other. And upon this principle, no proper man or faithful subject would blame or stigmatize the Grand Jury of Dublin, on supposition that they had appointed such clerical characters as you have represented. I applied to this lawyer, whom I have just now accosted, to advocate my cause ; he refused and said, " If your business was laid before the public authorities, it might be the means of preventing Catholic Emancipation." To refute the repeated attacks, foul aspersions and false imputations of aspiring lawyers and episcopal sycophants, I inserted in some of the public prints, the following document.

" To the Editor of the Hibernian Journal.

" SIR—Having seen in the Dublin Evening Post of the 1st instant, a paragraph mis-stating the ecclesiastical law and obedience of subjects to spiritual superiors, without commentary or distinction, and misrepresenting my conduct at the late execution of Mathew Osborn at Newgate. I beg leave to state, that the law

of the Church cannot supersede the *law of God*, or besotted infatuation *true obedience*.

“Our Saviour sent his apostles and their successors, as he was sent himself by his heavenly Father, and gave them a divine mission all over the world, without interruption or termination of time;—‘Go, and teach all nations, &c. and wherever you will not be received, leave that place or city, and preach the gospel, &c. wherever you shall be received; and lo, I will be with you to the consummation of the world,’ &c. Clergymen receive their spiritual powers from God through the merits of Jesus Christ, which no man on earth can deprive them of, or hinder them from the free exercise of the functions annexed to that divine authority, unless they bind themselves first by sin in the eyes of God, and unless that sin is proved by legal or canonical prosecution. *Causa non probata, non est causa*—A cause not proved, is no cause. Citation and conviction are two essential conditions to render any censures or suspensions, of any considerable moment, valid and binding, according to the law of God and man. Our Saviour called Adam to trial before he condemned him: ‘Adam, ubi es?—Adam, where are you?’ In the process of the sinful woman, Jesus Christ would not condemn or punish her, until a crime would be established by evidences and accusers:—‘Mulier, ubi sunt qui te accusabant?’ John 8.—‘Woman, where are your accusers?’ Pope Gregory and Pope Calixtus say, ‘that any sentence or definition unjustly and uncanonically issued by any bishop or

judge, cannot bind in conscience, or prevail in practice.' The great canonist, Vanespin, expressly says, 'that such censures, &c. should be despised and condemned; for such proceedings are contrary to the law of the Gospel and right reason.' We are to obey God before man; we are not to obey whatever is commanded contrary to God and his precepts. Sir, I positively affirm, and candidly declare, that I was never either canonically, or validly, suspended by any superior. Let Mr. Catholie, who is so passionately fond of talking of, and disseminating suspensions and disqualifications, without proving whether they are right or wrong, valid or invalid, binding or not binding, like a solid divine and candid man shew the necessary conditions of a just and valid suspension, and prove whether they ever existed in any fulminated against me. Let him also appear, and not hide his head any longer, like a snake in the grass, that we may know who he is and what he is. In succeeding ages, after the promulgation of the Gospel, Prelates divided districts and provinces into dioceses and parishes, and appointed pastors in each, with certain regulations, modes of discipline, and limited powers, reciprocally binding both subjects and superiors, within their respective spheres and jurisdictions, from infringing upon the rights and prerogatives of each other, without a just cause canonically proved, &c. By these laws the superior could not suspend the subject, at his own mere will, from exercising his peculiar functions, and administering spiritual consolation and eccle-

siastical rights to those committed to his charge; whereas he exercised this authority in his own *peculiar name* and *particular right*, but not according to the *will* and *caprice* of a *monopolizing* superior. This said law, as being human, could cease by abrogation and contrary custom. That this custom is now established and practised, especially in this country, nothing is more certain. Prelates give and take away benefices and ecclesiastical livings, according to their own free will and pleasure—suspend and degrade by their own arbitrary power, contrary to divine authority and the laws prescribed by the sacred canons: therefore no other criterion remains for the subject (in our days) but the divine, universal, and infallible law given to the apostles and their successors:—‘Go and teach all nations, preach the Gospel, and administer the sacraments wherever you are received.’

“When an interference of Protestant power and Protestant appointment of Roman Catholic Clergymen to ecclesiastical benefices are permitted and allowed in other countries for wise and cogent reasons, why not here as well as there?—When said Clergymen perform their respective functions, administer sacraments, &c. there legally and validly, why not here with the same authority and validity as there?

LAURENCE MORRISSY.

5th March, 1821.

R. C. Chaplain of Newgate, &c.”

When Clement VI. An. 1342, gave the greatest part of the English benefices to strangers and bad pastors, Edward III. King

of England interfered, by the advice and help of the English Clergy, and took the nomination and appointment of the benefices out of his hands, and said "that it was the Princes gave that nomination and appointment to the Popes for proper clergymen, &c. and when they abused that authority it behoved them to interfere, and do justice to religion, the subject, and the state, and appoint themselves," &c. By this interference and declaration of King Edward and the Clergy, we clearly see that the appointment of priests to the ecclesiastical benefices of realms is the natural right and prerogative of kings and their governments, for the peace and security of their realms, and good of their subjects—that when it was absolutely necessary for a Roman Catholic Prince to interpose his power and resumé his authority in appointing proper and faithful clergymen to ecclesiastical benefices, in the thirteenth century, in these countries, much more so is it actually necessary for a Protestant Prince to do so in the nineteenth century. If King George IV. would resume his right, and appoint his Roman Catholic clergymen to their respective benefices and secure their livings under his *paternal* protection, they would now advise and assist him against the intrigues of foreign power and episcopal influence, as the clergy did King Edward before. Until this measure will be adopted, no man will ever see Ireland quiet, the life of the proper and loyal subject will not be secured or his property safe. For similar reasons the King of France reserved the collation of benefices to himself in the

fourteenth century. All benefices that become vacant by *heresy* are reserved to the Holy See, by a constitution made by Pius V. According to this statute the Pope had, or could have, the fruits of my parish for the first year after it became vacant by heresy, which fruits would be, at least, in Rome equal to £1200 in this country; and Dr. Marum could also foist into the living a *cousin* of his own, or *barter*, to his *great advantage*, with some other priest. By this ecclesiastical law, it is the benefit and advantage of superiors, at home and abroad, that parish priests should be guilty of heresy, or any thing they could construe into heresy. And this is another powerful reason for which the faithful and liberal priest will be watched, &c. "The more heresy, the more profit—the more gain, &c. &c."

I shall once more endeavour to prove, by further developement, the implacable and irreconcilable disposition of his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects towards the British Constitution, and British Protestant subjects of the United Kingdom. In the first part of my work I have quoted the laws and decrees made by the Court of Rome and General Councils for the dethronement of Protestant Kings, and subversion of Protestant Constitutions. I have likewise proved and explained, by undeniable documents, the solemn oaths taken by Irish bishops, superiors of religious houses, beneficed clergymen, and notaries apostolic, &c. to support said laws and put them in execution whenever a favourable opportunity and probability of final success should offer. I have also

proved that this hostile spirit still exists, by producing, or promising to produce, a conference held between the bishop and clergy of the diocese of Ossory, wherein it was discussed how heretics were to be treated, and decided what punishments should be inflicted. * * * *
And finally, I shall disclose how these laws and principles are taught both clergy and laity, and handed down to the peasantry of the country—and the effects produced thereby.

A respectable divine, called *Dens*, wrote the *Course of Theology*; this author is highly recommended by our bishops and superiors to parish priests, and all those who have the care of souls and government of the people; this same author was re-printed in Dublin, by a Roman Catholic Bookseller, a few years ago, and distributed among the Roman Catholic clergymen throughout Ireland. In his treatise on faith, he explains and inculcates what punishments are, and should be, inflicted on heretics, viz.

1.—“ Heretics incur a major excommunication, which is reserved to the Pope, from which no man can absolve but his Holiness, or some clergyman delegated by him; therefore the Holy Father grants the Bishops of Ireland faculties, for five or six years only, to absolve those heretics who offer themselves, and desire to be reconciled to God and the Holy Roman Catholic Church. The same faculties are to be renewed at the expiration of every six years, or as it seems expedient to the Holy Court. By the same authority the bishops can sub-delegate their priests to receive here-

tics when they offer themselves up to the Church, &c. These reservations are made for two particular reasons:

1st—In order to shew the enormity of the crime of heresy; and 2dly, to excite a mortal hatred against heretics and the crime of heresy.

2dly—"They incur an irregularity, and their children likewise incur the same to the second degree at the paternal side, and at the maternal side to the first inclusively; besides, their favourers and abettors incur the same."

3dly—"They are incapable and unqualified for any ecclesiastical benefice and public office," Cap. Quicumque de Hereticis in 6. And on this principle—the inquisitorial Secretary, Mr. C. grounds my incapability and disqualification, and publishes it to the world, through the medium of prejudiced and inflammatory papers, and by the will and permission of his episcopal superiors.

4thly—"They are to be deprived of their benefices and dignities."

In consequence of this ecclesiastical law, I was deprived of my benefice and dignity. And thank God, shortly after the Catholic Emancipation will be granted, we shall treat the ministers of the Church of England after the same manner, and turn the Protestants out of the public offices, and make room for our own clergy and laity, &c.

5thly—"A privation of all spiritual jurisdiction, both in the internal and external forum."

I must suppose that this part of the law alludes to Roman Catholic clergymen, who become heretics, whereas no other clergymen

are considered to possess any spiritual power or jurisdiction more than the laity, according to the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church.

6thly—"Heretics are infamous people (*ipso jure*); and as such they are not allowed christian burial, or to be interred in consecrated ground, among the faithful." I saw an example of this abroad, where all the heretics, who die in a certain city are buried in a separate place for themselves, about a mile from the town. When the Roman Catholics shall be fully emancipated, the poor priests will not have the trouble of blessing the *clay* for the dead, in consequence of our church-yards losing their consecration since the first heretic was buried in them.

7thly—"The property of heretics is to be confiscated (*ipso jure*); they are to be banished, or to be imprisoned," &c. This author positively affirms that heretics are to be put to death, and quotes St. Thomas as another authority for his doctrine; and both declare "that as well as malefactors and disturbers of the state can be put to death, so can heretics, who are the falsifiers of faith and disturbers of religion." To authenticate his doctrine he quotes a text out of the Old Testament, wherein God orders false prophets to be put to death. Deut. chap. 17. v. 12.; "and that whoever is so proud as not to obey the orders of a priest, shall die." Chap. 18. Trac. de Ecclesial. Quest. V. N. 56. P. 117. 111.

I see that this divine is fond of supporting the old law still, and of course he may as well say that adulterers and blasphemers should be put to death now as well as heretics, because

it was ordered in the old law to put the one class to death as well as the other. If this law could be put in force now, I hope we should in a short time have a happy riddance of all our inquisitors, as they are the most false prophets we have in our days, and amongst them also we may find adulterers and blasphemers enough ! The priests who swallow down this doctrine are considered the most fit and most qualified pastors for the mission and the instruction of the people ; and those who are not tainted with such principles, are not considered *fit* or *capable*, &c.

I shall now come closer to the point in view, and shew how the young clergy and candidates of Ireland are instructed in the constitutions and ecclesiastical laws of the Court of Rome and Roman Catholic Church of Ireland, vitally affecting the Protestants of these realms ; who are denominated heretics and Anti-Catholics. In a certain college * * * supported by * * * there are young men from all the Dioceses of Ireland studying ; one of the professors there wrote the course of Theology for the students, Ann. 1815, which is read and taught in said College for the mission of Ireland. In this work is a treatise on the power and authority of the Roman Catholic Church ; and in this treatise the Apostolic Constitutions, and Decretals of Councils, for destroying Heretical Monarchs, and for dispensing with and disengaging their subjects from their allegiance and liege fidelity, &c. &c. are laid down : The superiority of the Pope over Kings and Princes, and the divine right of the Church of Rome above all others, are explained, &c.

I shall quote some of the passages.

1st—The Church of Christ is one, and therefore excludes all heretics from her communion. Quest. 1. N. 12. This is the faith of all tradition, which excludes all Heretics, without exception from the bosom of the Church.

2ndly—The Church of Christ, (the Roman Catholic Church) teaches, judges, and anathematizes: “Whoever does not hear this Church, look upon him as a Heathen and a Publican,” Matth. 16. This Church, divinely authorized, can eject from her bosom those subjects, who will not hear her; and will be rebellious; or oppose her; this is the doctrine of all the holy Fathers: hence, the definitions and anathemas of innumerable Councils against Heretics all over the world; therefore it is necessary you should know that all heretics which the Church (Roman Catholic) rejects and disowns do not belong to that Church; and for that reason, that there is no salvation for them, as St. Cyprian says, and all tradition affirms. Whoever leaves this Church will have no share in the merits or rewards of Jesus Christ—he is an alien, a profane man, and an enemy; and any man who leaves *this mother Church* cannot have *God as his Father*.” “As no person could be saved out of the ark, so no man can be saved out of this ark”—the Roman Catholic Church—“there is no other Church for believers, in which salvation can be obtained. It is manifest that this sentence of eternal death includes all those who left the Roman Church, and are condemned by her,” &c. &c.

3dly—The Bishops are, by divine right, the judges of all the controversies of faith; they and the Pope are the rock and foundation of the Church. The author quotes “that St. Cyprian reprimanded Poppinus, and told him that the Bishop is in the Church, and the Church in the Bishop; and that whoever is not with the Bishop, or at his side, is not in the Church.” “In like manner will we, after our emancipation, reproach His Majesty and his ministers publicly, as we do now privately, and tell them that if they are not with us, they are not in the Church of Christ”—the Roman Catholic Church! “That they are rebels and disturbers of our Church, and therefore that it behoves us to put the laws of our Church in force against the heretics of these countries, once more become Roman Catholic countries,” &c. &c.

4thly—“There is no better or more secure way for heretics to spread their errors, than to disseminate their books; therefore the Church can condemn these books, and prevent the faithful from reading them; for the Church can exercise her authority over the minds and morals of the people.” Quest. II. N. 220, 221.

5thly—The author lays before the students, clergy, and laity, the doctrine of the Council of Constance, viz. “that in order to be a Roman Catholic, the Council orders every man to condemn the books, doctrines, and the very persons of heretics.”

6thly—When Princes might prevent the good of religion and injure the salvation of the faithful, the Pope might interpose his au-

thority, and give permission to depose these monarchs, for their unjust laws and scandals, &c. The laws of all kings who do not approve of, and sanction the holy laws of Rome, are considered unjust, &c. And whereas, every diocese constitutes a perfect society, the bishop in like manner has an indirect power over the property of every man in that society.—The names of the kings and emperors who were dethroned by the councils are inserted, and of those who were put on thrones by said popes and councils.

7thly.—Whoever believes not, or denies any essential part of christian faith is not a christian, —and hence it is that heretics, who are such as obstinately deny any fundamental article of christianity, are in scripture ranked with heathens and infidels.—Math. 18. In a word—Popes maintain, that they have the same power that Christ gave St. Peter, when he said “whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven, and whatever you shall loose on earth will be loosed in Heaven,” and according to this divine law and divine power, they can bind Kings and Emperors down by ecclesiastical chains and censures, and depose them for the good of religion, and that in cases of heresy, &c.—they can loosen the subjects (*Vi clavium et autoritate Apostolica*) from their oath of allegiance, &c. What need I say more on this subject than to declare, that the laws, decrees, obligations, &c. are pointed out; that the priests and laity are taught, instructed impressed, &c. under the penalty of censures, privations and punishments, to

execute these and many more statutes and constitutions, rather prolix for insertion here.

What more can I say to prove and convince, that the inquisitorial laws are still in existence in this country against the laws and properties of all Protestants, denominated and condemned as Heretics and Anti-catholics. Every law has some end or object in view, and whilst the law holds, the object must virtually hold; and whilst the object is in contemplation, the spirit which first moved the measure must necessarily be alive, either virtually or actually, or both together, as it is the case at present in Ireland. This law I allude to, is made by the Head of the Church and his ecclesiastical government; they bind their subjects by oaths, &c. from the highest dignitary to the lowest in the Church, to support and execute the same—from the highest rank in the Catholic society, to the most abject plebeian; viz, the Pope is bound to support said laws, and his Cardinals, by sacred ties, are bound to both him and the Church—our Bishops take a solemn oath at their consecration to the same effect, already developed, down to the present day. The dignitaries of our Irish Church, among the secular and regular ecclesiastical orders, are bound by their respective offices in the Church to act in like manner for the same purpose; the young clergy are taught this inquisitorial law in our seminaries, colleges, and diocesan conferences; and thus are prepared to instruct the laity throughout the land. In a word what do we see but oaths and solemn ties among ecclesiastical superiors and inferiors in our days—

but oaths, rapine, plunder, &c. among the laity? If this cruel law and horrible system are antiquated and obsolete, why do superiors at present take these oaths, and bind others also to support said laws, and execute said measures? Why do they teach clergy and laity this doctrine and these measures? Why are not the oaths obsolete as well as the system? I ask, are solemn oaths to be taken without any meaning or design? By no means: for it would be perjury to do so. Are we surprised that the laity are taking similar oaths for similar purposes? From whence do these oaths of the peasantry and people of superior rank proceed?—what is the source? Do we not find some of them sworn by ecclesiastical superiors (for an example, Notaries Apostolic)? Alas! are not the misfortunes of Ireland in the present day conformable to the laws, oaths and measures I have disclosed, described and laid before the public? Are they not the natural results emanating from the inquisitorial systems now developed? Are not the bitter invectives, and public exclamations of clergy and laity, lawyers and sycophants against the government, appointments of Grand Juries to Roman Catholic Chaplaincies, and the overtures for the establishment of a salutary veto, the natural effects of ecclesiastical bigotry and ecclesiastical prejudice? Whoever does not believe the laws and facts I have stated, I am sure the same man would not believe a *miracle* from Heaven—No! nothing can convince him but a mortal blow.

Now, as the inquisitorial laws are general and unqualified, so must the Roman Catholic

Emancipation be general and unqualified in the end; viz. the Pope must have the nomination and appointment of Roman Catholic Monarchs to these realms—Ireland must be tributary to him again—the bishops and clergy must be reinstated in their glebes and church livings—the forfeited estates must be restored to the *right* owners—and the Established Church must be ROMAN CATHOLIC!—All the heretics in the land must be exterminated and their properties confiscated, and the nation must be purged from heresy, and the remains of heresy: then, and only then, will Roman Catholics consider themselves fully and unconditionally emancipated; this is what is understood by an unqualified Catholic Emancipation.

Now to conclude—let us consider what kind of religion those ecclesiastical inquisitorial superiors, and their clerical agents, who signalized, or rather stigmatized themselves in my case, have.

We must consider that mankind in general are divided into four classes with respect to religion.

1st, Christians—2d, Heretics—3d, Deists—and 4th, Atheists.

The first are those who profess and practice what Christ has revealed and the Apostles taught.

2dly—Heretics—Who profess christianity, but teach or maintain some erroneous doctrine, contrary to the word of God, and what the Apostles preached; or, according to the doctrine of the Roman Church, contrary to whatever she believes, teaches and commands.

3dly--Deists--Who deny the revealed religion of Jesus Christ, and thereby exclude the necessity of good works, for the obtaining eternal salvation, &c.

4thly--Atheists--Who deny the existence of the divine Being, and immortality of the soul.

All those who are conversant in the scriptures, and the laws upon which my persecutions and privations were grounded, will easily know to which of the foregoing classes do the priests and prelates, who were concerned in persecuting me, both at home and abroad; and who support the system of the holy inquisition, belong to. Therefore I need not take much pains in this representation, to convey a true idea, and make the necessary impression. However the following observations may not be amiss:—

A man may be guilty, various ways of the above crimes. The law of God commands “that we should not do unto another, what we would not wish another should do unto us;” it orders us “not to injure our neighbour in his soul, honour or property, &c.” It is manifestly known, that both the divine and human law were notoriously violated by my ecclesiastical superiors and clerical brethren, by the material injury they have done myself and many more, in our spiritual and temporal interest: Yes! an injury not repaired, but incessantly crying aloud for justice; and for these reasons, it is evident that the perpetrators concerned in the violation of the above laws do not bear the name of true christians,

and of course, cannot be counted among the first class above specified.

2ndly—My spiritual superiors wanted me to act against and violate the laws of God and man, as can be seen in different parts of my work. Many Priests requested I would bow to ecclesiastical authority, whether right or wrong; several of these clergy who joined the superiors, at the very time they were transgressing the divine and human laws, loudly proclaimed that they should be obeyed as well as Jesus Christ himself, if he would make his appearance a second time on earth; and therefore, according to the best Theologians and all true christians, these superiors and inferiors must be ranked, as professed Heretics, *ipso jure*, among the second order above mentioned, as broachers and maintainers of false and erroneous doctrine.

3dly—Deists deny the revealed religion, of our Saviour and do not acknowledge the necessity of it for obtaining eternal happiness; but my persecutors, Priests and Bishops did not only deny and impugn the known truth and revealed religion, by preaching false doctrine, and inculcating irreligious tenets, but also confirmed the principle by preventing others of preaching the gospel of Jesus Christ, and by keeping thousands from practising the religion established by the Son of God, and taught all nations by the Apostles; by forbidding divine worship, and receiving any sacraments, &c. &c. Could any Deists do more to destroy the very essence of revealed religion and true christianity? What can the transaction of Oning and Templeorum, and the insidious

attempts made by Priests and Bishops to prevent the knowledge of the word of God being diffused, and liberal principles of being imbibed in the Gaols and Bridewells of Dublin, but downright deism; therefore, the clerical gentlemen, thus tainted, must necessarily be enranked among the third class.

4thly—It is no wonder that those who are so immersed in deism, should launch into greater extremes and become Atheists. If the interior would be as well known as the exterior is, perhaps our doubts would be easily removed in the affirmative.

It is a maxim in every law, especially in morality, that superiors who connive at the faults, and encourage the mal-practises of inferiors, participate in their crimes, and incur the same guilt:—*Qui peccat, et qui peccanti consentit, uterque reus est.* Cap. 96.

All the irregularities, uncanonical proceedings, spiritual and temporal deprivations and infringements on the law of God, the church and the land, in my case, were regularly and duly communicated to the respective superiors, from the lowest to the head of the church:—

1st—From the Prelates of Ossory, to the Metropolitan of the province—

2nd—To the Primate of all Ireland—

3d—To the Cardinals in Rome—

And lastly, to the Pope himself.

All these Superiors, not only, connived at the horrid transactions and lamentable deeds of their subjects and inferiors, now laid before the public, but, highly, approved of their

conduct, from the commencement to the present period; which nothing else could sanction but the Inquisitorial System and confirmed Deism!!! I was greatly surprized when a certain Gentleman in Rome, told me, that some of the Clergy of the first rank and authority there, *were Deists*. *I had no difficulty in believing the fact, when experience convinced me of its reality*. But, thank God, they are not exclusively the *Church of Christ on Earth!!!*

FINIS.

which the
can

with some
comparisons,
—

Comparison of
the

Value of the

Discourse of

Disloyalty, &

Divided Allegiance

Design of

Emancipation

Exhortation,

Notes, &c

Index

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8



